Ahlussunnah-wal-Jamah Publications

Hiwar Hadi

bayna Sunnah wa Shia

A calm dialougue between Sunnah & Shia

By Shaykh

Dr. Abdul Rahman Dimashqiah



Hiwar Hadi bayna Sunnah wa Shia

A calm dialogue between Sunnah & Shia

By Shaykh Dr. Abdul Rahman Dimashqiah

Ahlussunnah-wal-Jamah Publications

F L A G O F T A W H E E D

www.flagoftawheed.com

A calm dialogue between Sunnah & Shia

by Shaykh Dr Abdurahman ad-Dimashiqah

Copyright © 2010, Ahlussunnah-wal-Jamah Publications

Authorised by flagoftawheed

With the permission of Shaykh Dr. Abdurahman ad-Dimashqiah

www.flagoftawheed.com

Islamic Media Website - Authentic Islamic Knowledge

info@flagoftawheed.com

info@idcuk.org

Mob: 07860292199 – 07590316785

This PDF book was published with permission of author. Please distribute, spread and print. The aim of this publication is to maximise benefit. Please the publication as it is. Feel free to upload onto other sites as long as a link is made to flagoftawheed.

Parts or entire publication can be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without permission of publisher.

NO COMMERCIAL USE ALLOWED. NO SELLING OF PUBLICATION IS ALLOWED

CONTENTS

PREFACE

In the Name of Allah Most Gracious Most Merciful

It gives us great pleasure to introduce to you a new PDF Publication by Shaykh Dr. Abdurahman ad-Dimashqiah. Between our hands is “A calm dialogue between Sunnah & Shia”. We hope this benefits the Ummah and helps them to clarify some issues for them. We live in times of great problems and confusion. We hope this will aid Ahlussunnah all over the world and to be an eye opener for those who seek the truth. May Allah’s peace and blessings be upon His last Messenger and those who follow him until the last day.

Abu Muwahhid
flagoftawheed

AUTHORS INTRODUCTION

Praise be to Allah, Lord of the worlds. Peace and blessings be upon the most noble of the Messengers, Muhammad,[1] and upon his family and Companions.

I dedicate this paper to every Shia who is willing to listen to constructive criticism with an open heart and an enlightened mind. This research is, in fact, a survey of the literature about the rise and spread of Shiism and its fundamental principles. Much of what follows is taken directly from Shia sources. Details of all the sources I have used are recorded in footnotes where interested readers will find page and volume numbers of the works cited. Anyone who wishes may then refer to the original Shia works and check what I have said.

I would like to stress that I do not intend to imply that every Shia must necessarily believe everything that I have reported about their beliefs and doctrines. My intention is simply to make clear to every Shia what the books of their religious leaders contain. These are things that many people still do not realize. My intention is to maintain an objective position, far from bigotry and blind allegiance to traditions. My only reason

[1] The blessings on the Prophet, upon whom be peace, will not be repeated in the text, but readers are requested to observe this *Sunnah* whenever his name is mentioned.

for writing it is to earn the pleasure of Allah and to clarify the truth to all who are interested to hear it. We should all free ourselves from prejudice and wild ideas, and avoid making inflammatory and insulting charges that fuel the emotions, block the path to truth, and widen the chasm between us. These things do nothing but dissipate the spirit of peace and harmony.

I am firmly convinced that we must begin with a sincere commitment to truth and believe that the struggle between truth and falsehood will continue until the Day of Resurrection. I am also convinced that truth must be presented without recourse to insults, curses or profanity. Allah has commanded us to observe the highest standards of dignity and self-respect when we argue with the "People of the Book."[2] Therefore, it is fitting for us to show even more respect to the people of our Book when we come to disagree with them and discuss these disagreements.

I look forward to the day when Allah joins our two communities with His Book and the *Sunnah* of His Messenger. May Allah hasten the day when He binds our hearts together again, after this long and bitter separation that has only benefited the enemies of the Muslims, and given them an ugly advantage from the beginning of our estrangement right up to today.

Shaykh Dr. Abdurahman ad-Dimashqiah

---

[2] This is a term used to designate the Christians and the Jews, who have a special legal status in Islamic Law. It is a direct translation of the Arabic *Ahlul-Kitâb*, which appears many times in the Glorious Qur’ân.

CHAPTER ONE

DOCTRINES OF THE SUNNIS AND SHIAS COMPARED

The Sunnis are moderate in their beliefs. They are not fanatics and do not innovate in matters of religion. The Sunni doctrine comes directly from the Qur'ân and the most strongly supported evidence from the *Sunnah* of the Prophet. The Qur'ân is from Allah; He has made it a light, a guide, and evidence of truth for those who worship Him. It contains no errors and is not wanting in any way. The Qur'ân we have today is the same Qur'ân that the Messenger taught us. No one has added anything to it and no one has removed anything from it. Although the enemies of Allah try to twist the Qur'ân and to raise doubts about it, they will always fail since Allah has promised to preserve it as He says in the verse which reads: {"*Indeed, it is We Who sent down the Message [i.e. the Qur'ân] and indeed, We will be its Guardian.*"}[1]

[1] Qur'ân 15: 9.

The Shia Belief about the Qur'ân

The Shia scholars do state what contradicts this concept of Allah's guarantee to protect the Qur'ân. To illustrate, Hâshim Al-Bahrânî, a Shiite exegete, in the introduction of his book *Al-Burhân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân*, the Hadîth scholar Mullâ Bâqir Al-Majlisî in his book *Mir'âtul-`Uqûl* (*Mirror of Minds*), Sheikh An-Nûrî At-Tubrasî[2], Ni`matul-Lâh Al-Jazâ'irî in his book *Al-Anwâr An-Nu`mâniyyah*, and others of Shia scholars, state that the Prophet's Companions made additions to its text, removed parts of it, and changed others. An-Nûrî At-Tubrasî quoted from Ni`matul-Lâh Al-Jazâ'irî that, "The Shia scholars uniformly agree to the authenticity of the recurrent narrations indicating the change in the Qur'ân."[3] Al-Kulaynî,[4] in his book *Al-Kâfî* (*The Sufficient*) makes the same charge saying that the whole Qur'ân consists of seventeen thousand verses though it is well known that the number of verses in the Qur'ân we all use is somewhere in the neighborhood of six thousand.[5] Finally, Al-Kulaynî asserts that

---

[2] An-Nûrî At-Tubrasî, *Faslul-Khitab fî Ithbât Tahrîf Kitâb Rabb Al-Arbâb*; see also Al-Sayyid Hâshim Al-Bahrânî, *Al-Burhân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân*, p. 49; Bâqir Al-Majlisî, *Mir'âtul-`Uqûl*; Ni`matul-Lâh Al-Jazâ'irî, *Al-Anwâr Al-Nu`mâniyyah*, 2: 356.

[3] An-Nûrî At-Tubrasî, *Faslul-Khitâb fî Ithbât Tahrîf Kitâb Rabbul-Al-Arbâb*, p. 30.

[4] Muhammad Ibn Ya`qûb Ibn Ishâq Al-Kulaynî Ar-Râzî (d. 328/939). A principal Shia theologian and scholar [*trans*]. Al-Kulaynî is the author of the Shias' most authoritative book of *fiqh*, *Al-Kâfî*, which the Shias believe is more reliable than *Sahîh Al-Bukhârî*. Sheikh `Abdul-Husayn Al-Mûsawî says that *Al-Kâfî* is the best and most reliable book of the Shia (*Al-Murâja`ât*, pp. 110-311). Likewise, Sheikh Muhammad Sâdiq As-Sadr in his book *Ash-Shî`ah* (*The Shia*) says, "It is said that *Al-Kâfî* was shown to the Mahdî (the Twelfth Imam) who said, "This is sufficient for our faction."

[5] In his exegesis of the Qur'ân entitled *As-Sâfî* (*The Crystal Clear*), Al-Kâshânî said, "As for Al-Kulaynî, may Allah bless him, he was convinced that [the Companions] had changed the

the complete Qur'ân was only compiled by their Imams.[6] According to him, Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq, said, "We have Fâtimah's Qur'ân and by Allah your Qur'ân does not contain a word of it."[7]

Al-Kâshânî says that the Qur'ân we have is not the complete Qur'ân that the Prophet brought.[8] According to him, the Qur'ân contradicts the Message revealed by Allah. He adds that some parts of it were not changed while other parts were deleted by the hypocrites (he means the Companions of the Prophet) such as deleting the name of `Alî from the Qur'ân. Al-Kâshânî also said, "…and they also removed the words 'the family of Muhammad' along with some of the hypocrites[9]." He further said, "As for our

---

Qur'ân and removed parts of it. He said this in his book *Al-Kâfî* and never failed to defend this position. In the beginning of his book, Al-Kulaynî also mentions that both he and his elder scholar, `Alî Ibn Ibrâhîm Al-Qummî, were convinced by reports of this, and points out that Al-Qummî's commentary on the Qur'ân is "full of such reports." (see Al-Kâshânî, *Tafsîr As-Sâfî*, 47:1).

[6] Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kâfî*, 1: 427; The Imams of the Ja`farî, or Imâmiyyah sect, with which this book is principally concerned, are twelve: `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, Al-Hasan, Al-Husayn, `Alî Zayn Al-`Âbidîn Ibnul-Husayn, Muhammad Al-Bâqir Ibn `Alî, Ja`far As-Sâdiq Ibn Muhammad, Mûsâ Al-Kâzim Ibn Ja`far, `Alî Ridâ Ibn Mûsâ, Muhammad Al-Jawâd Ibn `Alî, `Alî Al-Hâdî Ibn Muhammad, Al-Hasan Al-`Askarî Ibn `Alî, Al-Mahdî Al-Muntazar (believed to be in occultation), see Sobhî Mahmasânî, *Falsafat At-Tashrî` Al-Islâmî* (*Jurisprudence of Islamic Legislation*), p. 45) [*trans*].

[7] Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kâfî*, 1: 240.

[8] Al-Kâshânî, in his introduction to Al-Kulaynî's *As-Sâfî*.

[9] He refers to the Companions by the word "hypocrites".

[Shia's] scholar's belief in this regard, it is clear that Al-Kulaynî believed that the Qur'ân was changed; parts of it were changed and others were removed."[10]

An-Nûrî At-Tubrasî is among the most highly revered Shia scholars though he, in his book *Faslul-Khitâb* (*Decisive Judgment*), lists more than two thousand narrations of changes in the Qur'ân that he collected from a wide range of Shia books, among them Al-Kulaynî's *Al-Kâfî*. In reward for this, the Shias buried him in their most sacred cemetery, Al-Hujrah Al-Murtadawiyyah (i.e., the Room of Al-Murtadâ), at An-Najaf in Iraq.

Lastly, Kamâlud-Dîn Maytham Al-Bahrânî tells us in his commentary on *Nahjul-Balâghah* (*Method of Eloquence*) that `Uthmân Ibn `Affân "collected the Qur'ân according to the way of recitation of Zayd Ibn Thâbit, then he burned all the other copies, throwing out what was a doubtless part of the Qur'ân."[11]

Samples of "Changed" Verses

Al-Kulaynî and `Alî Ibn Ibrâhîm Al-Qummî[12] assert that the Companions changed many verses of the Qur'ân. They give us examples of some of these, (the words that are asserted to have been removed are set in italics).

---

[10] Al-Kâshânî, also Al-Kashshî, Muhammad Murtadâ Mullâ Muhsin Al-Kâshânî (d. 1090/1679), *As-Sâfî*, pp. 14, 47.

[11] `Abdul-Hamîd Ibn Hibatul-Lâh Al-Madâ'inî Ibnul-Hadîd (d. 586/1190), *Sharh Nahjul-Balâghah* (*Explaining the Method of Eloquence*), 1: 11 (Iran), a commentary on a collection of sayings attributed to `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, may Allah be pleased with him.

[12] `Alî Ibn Ibrâhîm Ibn Hâshim Al-Qummî, hereinafter referred to simply as "Al-Qummî," was a Shia exegete of the Qur'ân who lived in the fourth century after Hijrah. He is not to be confused with the *faqîh* Abû Ja`far Muhammad Ibn `Alî Ibnul-Husayn Ibn Mûsâ Ibn

- And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger *in the Imamate of `Alî and the Imams who succeed him* has certainly attained a great attainment.[13]
- A supplicant asked for a punishment bound to happen - To the disbelievers; *in the Imamate of `Alî* of it there is no preventer.[14]
- And if you are in doubt about what We have sent down [i.e. the Qur'ân] upon Our Servant [i.e. Prophet Mu<u>h</u>ammad] *concerning the Imamate of `Alî...* [15]
- And those who have wronged *the family of Mu<u>h</u>ammad* are going to know to what [kind of] return they will be returned.
- You are the best nation produced [as an example] for mankind . . ., Commenting on this verse, Al-Qummî relates that Abû `Abdullâh said "Those who killed Al-<u>H</u>asan and Al-<u>H</u>usayn are the best nation produced [as an example] for mankind?" Someone asked him, "Then what did the Qur'ân really say?" He said, "You are the best Imams produced [as an example] for mankind?"[16]
- But if they had done what they were instructed *in the matter of `Alî.*

Bâbawayh Al-Qummî A<u>s</u>-<u>S</u>âdiq, herein referred to as Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî (d. 381 h.), author of the book *`Uyûn Akhbâr Ar-Ri<u>d</u>â* (*Top Narratives of Ar-Ri<u>d</u>â*) [*trans*].

[13] Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kâfî*, 1: 414.

[14] Ibid. 2 :422.

[15] Ibid. 1:417.

[16] This "interpretation" depends upon a rereading of one word in the Arabic original. The Arabic reads *"Kuntum khaira **ummatin** ukhrijat lin-nâs."* To support the interpretation reported above it is necessary to read *"Kuntum khaira **a'immatin** ukhrijat lin-nâs."* The substitution is the word ***a'immah*** (**Imams**) for ***ummah*** (**nation**). These words sound similar and are spelled similarly [*trans*].

- "O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord, *in the matter of `Alî* and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His Message." Commenting on this verse, Al-Qummî said, "When Allah revealed this verse, the Prophet told `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, "Had I not conveyed what I had been ordered to covey about your succession (Imamate), my deeds would have been in vain."[17]

These are a few of the verses that the Shias accuse the Companions of changing. They do not seem to realize that this raises doubts about the Qur'ân since Allah says, *{"Indeed, it is We Who sent down the Message [i.e. the Qur'ân] and indeed, We will be its Guardian."}*[18] This means that Allah will preserve the Qur'ân, protect it, and prevent anyone from changing it.

Shah Muhammad,[19] a Qajar ruler of Iran, once asked Sheikh `Alî Asghar Barjardî to write a book and explain clearly the beliefs of the Shias. In this book, called *The Doctrines of the Shias,*[20] Barjardî explains that "We must believe that it is impossible to change the original Qur'ân, but the hypocrites [he means the Companions] both added things to the Qur'ân we have, and took things out of it. The original Qur'ân is with the Imam of the Age,[21] may Allah hasten his return."[22]

---

[17] *Tafsir Nûrul-Thaqalayn.*
[18] Qur'ân 15:9.
[19] Shah Muhammad, ruled 1193/1779-1212/1797, first Shah of the Qajar dynasty of Iran. They were Turkmens of the Qajar tribe overthrown by Reza Khan, the father of the last Shah of Iran, Muhammad Reza, in 1924 [*trans*].
[20] `Alî Asghar Barjardî, *`Aqâ'id Ash-Shî`ah*.
[21] This refers to the Twelfth Imam who the Shias say disappeared into a cave a thousand years ago [*trans*].
[22] `Alî Asghar Barjardî, *`Aqâ'id Ash-Shî`ah*, p. 27.

There are some sincere Shias who reject this doctrine, but since they reject this part of Shia belief, why do they still blindly follow the rest of it? Why do they not condemn these heretical scholars and abandon Shiism? Merely denouncing their ideas while still following their sect is not enough. To stay in a sect founded in error is to stay in error. Many Christians deny the doctrine of the Trinity and reject the cult of saints. Many of them do not believe in the divinity of human beings, but they still associate themselves with a religion that fails to convince them. Surely, they are only following the traditions of their ancestors.

Since most ordinary Shias have rejected the belief of distorting the Qur'ân, their sheikhs have become obliged to deny this shameful idea. But if they were sincere about this, they would admit what such books contain, for these books, which they regularly reprint, usually find their way into the hands of ordinary Muslims. In such books we can find many narrations that support the idea of changing the Qur'ân. This idea is greatly considered by Shia scholars and prominent figures as it is stated in their main references, such as *Al-Kâfî*.

Al-Khû'î's Attitude toward the Changing of the Qur'ân

There is a group of Shias who dissociate themselves from the belief that the Companions changed the Qur'ân. These follow Imam Al-Khû'î, a prominent scholar, who is the director of Al-Hawzah Al-`Ilmiyyah based at An-Najaf. He passed a ruling to prohibit this belief. While they say they follow him alone, they still overlook two points:

1. Al-Khû'î is not a prominent figure in comparison with such scholars as Al-Kulaynî, Al-Qummî, Al-Majlisî, and other Shia scholars.[23] The primary Shia references are still the books of major Shia scholars, all of which contain references to this belief while they are the main sources for students and scholars alike. So let Al-Khû'î talk on behalf of them and admit that the books of such prominent Shia scholars stated that the Qur'ân was changed; otherwise, he would be concealing testimony.
2. After considering all the views about the authenticity of the Qur'ân, Al-Khû'î says, "Clearly the story about how the Companions changed the Qur'ân is nothing but a fairy tale; only the feeble-minded could believe it."[24]

Nevertheless, Al-Khû'î himself still has an opinion, which someway resembles some o such "fairy tales". In the very book in which he rejected the idea of changing the Qur'ân, he says that, "There is a "Qur'ân of `Alî; the order of the chapters of this Qur'ân is different from the one present nowadays, and its existence is a fact that one should not doubt. Shia scholars are all agreed on the existence of `Alî's Qur'ân; and this consensus has sufficed us to undertake the effort to prove it. Having additions which do not appear in the present Qur'ân – even if this opinion is right – is not sufficient evidence to prove that such additions were part of the Qur'ân and were removed through distortion. The preponderant opinion is that the additions in `Alî's Qur'ân are

---

[23] Mu<u>h</u>ammad Al-Bâqir Ibn Mu<u>h</u>ammad At-Taqiyy Ibn Maq<u>s</u>ûd `Alî Akmal Al-Majlisî Al-I<u>s</u>fâhânî (1110/ 1700). *<u>H</u>adîth* scholar and theologian, author of numerous works including *Bi<u>h</u>âr Al-Anwâr* (*Seas of Lights*) and *Mir'âtul-`Uqûl* (*Mirrors of Minds*) [*trans*].
[24] Al-Khû'î, *Al-Bayân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân*, p. 259.

only meant to explain and interpret the text. It also may be included under interpretations revealed by Allah to explain Qur'anic verses."

Here Al-Khû'î confirms two things:

First, there is another Qur'ân, "`Alî's Qur'ân," which is different from the Qur'ân that Muslims have today in content and in chapter arrangement. Second, Allah revealed the Qur'ân and explained its meaning.

Can anyone believe that Allah revealed the Qur'ân with explanations of its meanings? From a scholar, Al-Khû'î, who is known for being reasonable, such declarations are astonishing. Why should we not join in a common belief, one that is clear and honest? Why should we not all recognize that the Qur'ân, that is with us and in our mosques, is the same Qur'ân that Muhammad taught us, which is free of additions and omissions? When will we finish with this talk of a hidden Qur'ân with the Invisible Imam, about Fâtimah's Qur'ân and `Alî's Qur'ân? If we cannot agree on this, then how will our two communities ever find any common ground? And how could we possibly agree about anything else

CHAPTER TWO

SOURCES OF THE *SUNNAH*

According to Sunni Muslims, the *Sunnah* of the Prophet is the second main source of legislation after the Qur'ân. This relates to the sayings and actions of the Prophet reported in the Prophet's *hadîth,*[1] and includes explanations of the Qur'ân. The Prophet said, "Adhere strictly to my *Sunnah.*[2]" It is, therefore, sufficient honor for Sunni Muslims to be attributed to Prophet's *Sunnah* (by being called *Ahlus-Sunnah*).[3]

Sunni Muslims use two primary *hadîth* references; these are the collections of Imams Al-Bukhârî and Muslim. There are also several other collections of *hadîth*s that include

---

[1] *Hadîth*: The term refers to all that is narrated from the Prophet (PBUH): his acts, his sayings, and whatever he approved, in addition to all the reports which describe his physical attributes and character. [*trans*].

[2] Al-Albânî, *Silsilat Al-Ahâdîth As-Sahîhah* (*The Collection of Authentic Hadîths*), p. 361.

[3] A commonly used term that means "the Adherents of the *Sunnah* and Muslim Community" and refers to "Sunni Muslims" [*trans*].

weak reports as well as authentic, or confirmed narrations. Examples of these are Imam Ahmad's *Musnad*, the books called *Sunan* of Abû Dâwûd, At-Tirmidhî, At-Tabarânî, and Ibn Mâjah, Ibn Hibbân's *Sahîh*, and Imam Mâlik's *Muwatta'*. Since these books contain reports that are not always well supported, it is necessary to confirm the reliability of narrations quoted from them. This is done by critically examining the *isnâd*, i.e., chain of transmission.[4] It is not enough to say simply, "Abû Dâwûd reported it." One must go further and prove that the narration is authentic. This is not, however, the case with the collections of Al-Bukhârî and Muslim. These have been critically examined and everything in them is reliable.

The Sources of the *Sunnah* according to the Shias

The Shias do not depend upon the *hadîth* references used by the Sunnis like Al-Bukhârî and Muslim. They have their own collections that they believe are more reliable than those of the Sunnis since the narrations they contain are attributed to the Imams of the "Household of the Prophet." For them, any narration must meet several conditions before they accept it. The following are among these:

1). The narrators who report it must be belonging to the Imâmiyyah (Duodecimal Imamate, or Twelve-Imam Shias). They must also be upright in character and trustworthy.

2). Its chain of transmission must be traced back to one of the "infallible" Imams.

[4] This is one of the supporting evidences that demonstrate the reliability of a *hadîth*. *Isnâd* means support in Arabic. This usually consists of the names of the narrators who consecutively passed the report down. For example, so and so said, that he heard so and so say, that he heard so and so say, that he heard the Prophet say such and such [*trans*].

The Zaydite Shias [Az-Zaydiyyah] disagree with the Twelve-Imam Shias about this and accept *hadîth* from any upright and trustworthy source, even if it is not related by one belonging to the Twelve-Imam Shias.

Still, Shia sources contain many contradictions concerning the trustworthiness of their narrators. For example, we find `Abdul-Husayn Al-Mûsawî, a well-known source on Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq, defending Zurârah Ibn A`yan saying, "We find no reason to criticize him. Only profligate and malicious people could find fault with him."[5] But other of their books assert that Imam Ja`far himself said "Zurârah has attributed lies to me," and added, "May Allah curse Zurârah, may Allah curse Zurârah, may Allah curse Zurârah." It is also reported that Imam Ja`far said, "If Zurârah falls ill, do not visit him, and when he dies, do not witness his funereal. Zurârah is worse than a Jew or a Christian," and "Surely, Allah has turned Zurârah's heart upside down."[6]

`Abudul-Husayn Al-Mûsawî also says about Hishâm Ibnul-Hakam, "Those who wanted to extinguish the light of Allah accused him of believing in anthropomorphism (the doctrine that likens Allah to human beings), out of jealousy and envy for the Household of the Prophet,[7] and in enmity toward them. We are best aware of his teachings."[8] Yet, Al-Kulaynî, As-Sadûq and At-Tubrasî all report from him what affirms his believing in anthropomorphism.[9] This represents a flat contradiction in the way

---

[5] `Abdul-Husayn Al-Mûsawî, *Al-Murâja`ât*, p. 110.

[6] See Al-Kâshî [Al-Kâshânî], *Rijâl*, pp. 146, 160; Al-Mamaqanî, *Tanqîh Al-Maqâl*, 1:443, 444; Al-Khû'î, *Mu`jam Rijâl Al-Hadîth* (*Dictionary of Hadîth Narrators*).

[7] *Ahlul-Bayt*, see Chapter Four, fn. 28.

[8] `Abdul-Husayn Al-Mûsawî, *Al-Murâji`ât*, p. 312.

[9] Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kâfî*, 1:104, 106; At-Tubrasî, *Al-Ihtijâj `Alâ Ahl Al-Lijâj*, 2: 155; As-Sadûq, *At-Tawhîd*.

they assess the reliability of *hadîth* narrations.[10] For more illustration, see Az-Zar`î's *Rijâl Ash-Shî`ah fî Al-Mîzân* (*Shia Narrators in the Balance*).

Shias prefer to describe themselves with the word *shia*, which indicates exclusive and sectarian mentality, to the word "*Sunnah*" which indicates following a constant method among all Muslims, and means to act according to the Prophet's Tradition. Shia sources, as well, stress the importance of following the Prophet's *Sunnah*. Al-Kulaynî says in his book, *Al-Kâfî* that whoever rejects anything from the Book of Allah or the *Sunnah* of His Prophet has declared his disbelief in Islam.[11]

It is narrated that `Alî said, "We are required to act according to the Book of Allah and the example of the Prophet, and to cling to his *Sunnah*.[12]

At-Tubrasî reports in his book *Al-Ihtijâj* that the Prophet said, "Whenever a *hadîth* is reported to you, refer it to the Book of Allah and my *Sunnah*."[13]

Why should we not all identify ourselves with the path of the Prophet and his *Sunnah*? Surely, this is sufficiently honorable for all of us and more fitting than the word "*shia*," with its feeling of sectarianism and factionalism, as Allah has said:

*{... and do not be of those who associate others with Allah - [Or] of those who have divided their religion and become sects [**shia**], every faction rejoicing of what it has.}*[14]

---

[10] For more detailed information on this subject, see Az-Zar`î, *Rijâl Ash-Shî`ah fil-Mîzân*, and the book, *Al-Bayanât fî Abâtîl Al-Murâja`ât*.
[11] Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Usûl min Al-Kâfî*, 1:59, 70.
[12] Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 2: 82.
[13] Radî Ad-Dîn At-Tubrasî, *Al-Ihtijâj `alâ Ahl Al-Lijâj*, p. 222.
[14] Qur'ân 30: 31-32.

And Allah also says,

{Indeed, those who have divided their religion and become sects [shia] - you, [O Muhammad], are not [associated] with them in anything. Their affair is only [left] to Allah; then He will inform them about what they used to do.}[15]

The Meaning of the Word "Shia"

The word *shia* was first used as a description for the two factions that arose because of the dispute between `Alî and Mu`âwiyah. These were known as the "*shia*," or faction of `Alî and the "*shia*" of Mu`âwiyah, in the sense of supporters. The term should have fallen out of use once the conflict between them was resolved.

The word ***shia*** applies today to a group who are independent of the Sunnis in terms of doctrines, jurisprudence, principles of Islamic jurisprudence, and the way of understanding Islam. The original "*shia* of `Alî" were in fact Sunnis in terms of doctrine and religion. There is no rational Sunni Muslim who knows about these events yet does not believe that truth was with `Alî and that Mu`âwiyah and his supporters wronged `Alî. Sunnis believe that those who died defending `Alî's right were, Allah willing, martyrs. Whoever differs with this view has differed with what the Prophet himself has taught us.

Contemporary Shias have their origin in the Shias of Kufa,[16] who defied the Commander of the Faithful, `Alî, as Al-Murtadâ reports in *Nahjul-Balâghah*, "You were called to *jihad* (fighting in the Cause of Allah) but you did not go," said `Alî Ibn Abû

---

15 Qur'ân 6: 159.

16 We will return to a discussion of `Alî's position with regard to the people of Kufa later.

Ṯâlib, "you were called to obedience but you did not obey. Would that I had never seen you and never known you, may Allah strike you down. You have filled my heart with rage. Would that Allah separate me from you and grant me more worthy companions than you. O Allah, I have grown weary of them and they of me. I have vexed them and they me. Grant me better company than them, and grant them [a leader] less than me."[17]

The Meaning of the Word "Sunni"

The word ***sunni*** has always symbolized a commitment to following the *Sunnah* of the Prophet, rather than the traditional loyalties of any particular group. No one can rightly be called "Sunni" except someone who is committed, above everything else, to following the guidance of the Prophet's example in every way. Some people may be called "Sunnis" but do not perform prayer, do not fast, and do not follow anything of the *Sunnah.* Such people are not following the *Sunnah* and so cannot be called Sunnis, even if the words "Sunni Muslim" are written on their birth certificates.

The Collection and Recording of the *Sunnah*

Who really collected the information we have about the *Sunnah* and passed it down to us? Some of the Shias claim that it was the Twelve Imams of the Shias who did this, but this is far from the truth. When Allah revealed the verse *{"... This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favor upon you and have approved for you Islam as*

[17] Al-Murtaḏâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, pp. 65, 70, 230.

religion… }[18], both Al-Hasan and Al-Husayn were still small boys. As for the nine other Imams, they had not even been born yet. Naturally, those who reported and preserved all we know about the *Sunnah* and taught it to the people were the Companions of the Prophet. Certainly this group includes his wives,[19] `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, Al-`Abbâs, Abû Bakr, `Umar, and `Uthmân.

[18] Qur'ân 5: 3.
[19] *Ahlul-Bayt*, see Chapter Four, fn. 28.

CHAPTER THREE

PILGRIMAGE TO GRAVES AND TO THE SHRINES OF IMAMS

Sunni Muslims follow the instructions of the Prophet who said, "Allah has cursed the Jews and the Christians for taking the graves of their Prophets and righteous men as places of worship. Do not make the graves of your prophets into mosques, for I forbid you from this."[1] Out of fear from falling into disbelief, they have been careful to avoid any resemblance to the Christians and the Jews. In another matter, they are also careful to follow the Prophet's orders. He said, "If you ask for anything, then ask Allah, and if you seek help, then seek help from Allah."[2] Therefore, they address their prayers and supplications to Allah Alone. They do not visit the graves of the dead to ask their favors instead of praying to the Ever-Living God Who does not die, by Whose Hand Alone both harm and benefit come.

---

[1] Al-Bukhârî, Muslim, An-Nasâ'î, and Mâlik.

[2] At-Tirmidhî; Al-Albânî confirms that it is sahîh (authentic) in his edition of *Mishkât Al-Masâbîh*.

As for the Shias, it is a normal thing for them to visit of the graves of their Imams and give money to the custodians of these tombs. All of them approve of this. One of their scholars, Sheikh Al-Mufîd, tells us in his book *Al-Irshâd* (*Guidance*) that "…just one visit to the grave of Al-Husayn is like performing *Hajj* (Pilgrimage) a hundred times and performing `*Umrah* (Minor Pilgrimage) a hundred times; whoever visits Al-Husayn grave is assured Paradise.[3] He also says, "Whoever visits the graves of the Prophet's Household is protected by Allah from the Hellfire and surely will admit him to Paradise."[4]

The Shias, thus, have invented *hadîth*s to describe the merits of visiting these shrines and weeping therein as well as reciting special prayers that have been invented for the purpose of these visits. Certainly such things would not have been accepted by any member of the Prophet's Household neither would they have liked what Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî said that whoever visits the grave of Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq or Imam Al-Husayn, has the reward of seventy Pilgrimages, or that to spend the night at Al-Husayn's grave is like visiting Allah's Throne.[5] Moreover, he tells us that Allah Himself visits the grave of `Alî, as do the Prophets and the believers.[6] Is it possible that people will still be eager to visit Al-Masjid Al-Harâm (the Sacred Mosque) at Mecca if visiting the graves of the Imams is more important and brings a greater reward? This is

---

[3] Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibn An-Nu`mân Ibn `Abdus-Salâm Al-`Ukbarî Al-`Arabî Al-Hâritî Al-Baghdâdî Al-Mufîd Ibnul-Mu`allim (d. 413/1022), *Al-Irshâd fî Ma`rifat Hujaj Allâh `alâ Al-`Ibâd*, 252; also `Abdullâh Al-Ansârî, *Ma`a Al-Khatîb fî Khutûtih Al-`Arîdah*, 81.

[4] Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî,*`Uyûn Akhbâr Ar-Ridâ*, 255; also Al-Ansârî, op. cit., p.18.

[5] Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî, *`Uyûn Akhbâr Ar-Ridâ*, 2:259; Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan At-Tûsî, Sheikh At-Tâ'ifah (d. 459/1917), *Tahdhîb Al-Ahkâm* (*Abridging Rulings*), 6:51; Al-Majlisî, *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, pp.101, 105.

[6] Al-Majlisî, *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, pp. 100, 257.

why they encourage one another to fill their mosques with graves and to build new shrines. A shrine or a grave, they believe, is a more fitting place for worship than mere mosque.

Today the Shias' attention is constantly drawn to the graveyard and the sepulcher. They kiss the walls of tombs, hang money on them, and address their private prayers to the dead. New graveyards crowd the precincts of old shrines as they believe that whoever is buried near the shrine of an Imam will be protected from the punishment in the grave and on the Day of Resurrection, a door will be opened for him to Paradise. Thus, there is a clear resemblance between this and the beliefs and practices of the Jews and the Christians. These are the same practices for which Allah has cursed the "People of the Book."

While the Shias remain opposed to the use of *Qiyâs* (Analogical Deduction)[7], this does not prevent them from making an analogy between the kissing and caressing of the tombs of the Imams and the kissing of the Black Stone at Mecca. But while it is an act of the *Sunnah* to kiss the Black Stone, this cannot apply to tombs. The Companions of the Prophet did not do such things. `Alî did not kiss the tombs of the Prophet and his household, or hang from the walls and doors of shrines like those who claim to follow him do today.

Any rational person will see that what the Shias and the Sufis do at the graves of Imams and righteous people throughout the Islamic world is just like what the Christians do at their shrines and monasteries where they seek the blessings of statutes of Christ and Mary. Buddhists and Hindus also do the same thing at their temples, and

[7] A secondary principle of Islamic jurisprudence; it is the process of passing a judgment upon a certain issue on the basis of another one due to similar features common between them.

do not neglect to kiss the doors and wail as they present their offerings of food and money and ask for the favors of the dead rather than of the Ever-Living One Who never dies.

As for the Sunnis, they have maintained a moderate position between those who curse the Prophet's Household and those who exaggerate their love for them through seeking their help, travel aiming their graves, considering that visiting such graves of more reward than visiting the Sacred Mosque. The Sunnis deny that the dead can intermediate between the worshiper and his Lord. A mosque and a grave are two things that can never be confused in the mind of a true Muslim who devotes his worship to Allah. Allah has said, *{"And [He revealed] that the masjids are for Allah, so do not invoke with Allah anyone."}*[8] Not only is it the height of idiocy, but it is also disbelief to go to the mosque and say "O Allah!" and then a little later go to a grave and say "O `Alî, O Al-Husayn!" If visiting the grave of one of the Imams was equal to performing *Hajj* a hundred times, then why would a visit to the grave of Allah's Messenger not be equal to this, or more? Why do they insist so much upon the Prophet's Household while neglecting the Prophet himself? Is their love for his family greater than their love for him?

Seeking the Aid of the Imams in Times of Adversity

The Sunnis believe that love for Al-Hasan and Al-Husayn is something that pleases Allah and is obligatory on every Muslim. Imam Ash-Shâfi`î points out, however, that the Shias' habit of calling on Al-Husayn and others, saying such things as "O `Alî, O Al-Husayn, O Mahdî, O Master of the Age," is wrong. The naming of children `Abdul-Husayn (servant

[8] Qur'ân 72:18.

of Al-Husayn) and `Abdul-Hasan (servant of Al-Hasan) is also contrary to the *Sharî`ah*. The Sunni Muslims see this in the same light as they see the Christians' naming of their sons `Abdul-Masîh.[9] Jesus and Al-Husayn were both servants of Allah. The best names are those that express submission to Allah, such as `Abdullâh (servant of Allah) and `Abdur-Rahmân (servant of the Most Beneficent). These names include the Divine Qualities and Attributes of Allah and remind us of the worship and devotion that are due only to Allah. Whoever replaces one of Allah's Divine Names with the name of another has directed an act of worship to another beside Allah. The Sunnis, on the other hand, address their personal and private prayers to Allah Alone. They long for His help Alone in times of adversity. They love the Household of the Prophet but do not make them into saints and minor deities. [True] Muslims represent a middle way, between the Jews, who totally denied Jesus, and the belief of the Christians who worship him. Likewise, true Muslims take a middle position between those who curse the Household of Prophet and those who worship them and raise them up above the Prophets.

Thus, the Sunnis call upon Allah Alone, for He is nearer to them than their jugular vein. Whenever they call upon Him, He hears the call of all who worship Him. He hears them all wherever they are. He is All-Merciful, quick to respond and totally aware of the needs of His worshipers, even when they do not appeal to Him for help. Allah says:

> *{Say, "Shall we invoke instead of Allah that which neither benefits us nor harms us and be turned back on our heels after Allah has guided us?"}*[10]

---

[9] "Servant of the Messiah", this is a name used by Arab Christians [*trans*].
[10] Qur'ân 6: 71.

The Swearing of Oaths to Another besides Allah

Sunnis believe that taking oaths by the Prophet's Household other than Allah is an act of polytheism. The Prophet warned us about this and said, "Whoever swears by other than Allah is committing an act of polytheism."[11] In another *hadîth*, the Prophet said, "Whoever swears an oath must swear by Allah or otherwise keep quiet."[12] Christians do this too, and swear by Jesus rather than by Allah.

---

[11] At-Tirmidhî, chapter of *An-Nudhûr wa Al-Aymân* (*Vows and Oaths*); it is narrated through an authentic chain of transmission.
[12] Al-Bukhârî, Muslim, At-Tirmidhî, Abû Dâwûd, and An-Nasâ'î.

CHAPTER FOUR

ON INFALLIBILITY

The Sunnis acknowledge the merits of the House of the Prophet and the correctness of their religion, but they do not say they were infallible, for every human being is prone to error. No one is exempted from error, which is a quality of human nature. The Prophet pointed this out when he said, "Man is liable to mistake, and the best of those who do are those who turn to Allah in repentance."[13] While the Prophets infallibly convey the Revelation, their infallibility does not extend beyond this. How many Prophets have been admonished by Allah, and on occasions corrected? Allah mildly reproved the Prophet in a well-known Chapter of the Qur'ân, saying:

---

[13] At-Tirmidhî, Ibn Mâjah and Ad-Dârimî, it is narrated with a good chain of transmission; Ibnul-Athîr, *Jâmi` Al-Usûl min Ahâdîth Ar-Rasûl*, 2:515. (*The Collection of Prophetic Hadîths Sources*).

{"He [i.e. the Prophet] frowned and turned away - Because there came to him the blind man, [interrupting]. But what would make you perceive, [O Muhammad], that perhaps he might be purified – Or be reminded and the remembrance would benefit him? As for he who thinks himself without need, - To him you give attention. And not upon you [is any blame] if he will not be purified. But as for he who came to you striving [for knowledge] - While he fears [Allah], - From him you are distracted. No! Indeed, they [i.e. these verses] are a reminder… }[14]

On another occasion, Allah tells Prophet Muhammad:

{May Allah pardon you, [O Muhammad]; why did you give them permission [to remain behind]? [You should not have] until it was evident to you who were truthful and you knew [who were] the liars.} [15]

Allah also says addressing the Prophet, *{"… while you concealed within yourself that which Allah is to disclose. And you* ***feared the people****, while Allah has more right that you fear Him… "}*[16]

There are other examples in the Qur'ân which confirm the fact that Prophets' infallibly does not extend beyond conveying Revelation. An example of this is the verse that reads, *{"[Noah] said, "My Lord, I seek refuge with You from asking that of which I have*

[14] Qur'ân 80:1-11.
[15] Qur'ân 9:43.
[16] Qur'ân 33: 37.

no knowledge. And unless You ***forgive me*** *and have mercy upon me, I will be among the losers."*}[17]

And in another verse Prophet Ibrâhîm (Abraham) says, {"*And Who I aspire that He will forgive me* ***my sin*** *on the Day of Recompense."*}[18]

Allah also tells about Yûnus (Jonah), *{"And [mention] the man of the fish [i.e. Jonah], when he went off in anger and thought that We would not decree [anything] upon him. And he called out within the darknesses, "There is no deity except You; Exalted are You. Indeed,* ***I have been of the wrongdoers****."}*[19]

The Doctrine of the Infallibility of the Imams

The Shias believe their Imams are infallible in every respect. They see only a superficial distinction between the status of an Imam and that of a Prophet. In his book *Bihâr Al-Anwâr* (under the chapter entitled "Imams are more Knowledgeable than Prophets"), Al-Majlisî says, "We do not admit any difference between the concept of the Prophethood and that of the Imamate."[20] Sheikh Muhammad Ridâ Al-Mudhaffar says, "We believe the Imam, like the Prophet, must be free from all forms of corruption and vice, what is apparent of them and what is concealed, whether committed deliberately or neglectfully,

[17] Qur'ân 11: 47.
[18] Qur'ân 26: 82.
[19] Qur'ân 21: 87
[20] Al-Majlisî, *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, 26:82; and Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî,* 21:260-263.

from the time of infancy until death. Likewise, an Imam must be free from absentmindedness, forgetfulness and error."[21]

Because of the "infallibility" of their Imams, Shia scholars, including Imam Khomeini, believe their Imams' teachings have the same status as the Qur'ân. This is because the Imams are "above forgetfulness."[22] It is sufficient to have a glance through the contents of Al-Kulaynî's *Al-Kâfî* to be acquainted with this idea; Al-Kulaynî says in the table of contents:

- The Imams have all of the knowledge that was given to the Prophets and the Angels.
- The Imams know when they will die and they only die at the time of their own choice.
- The Imams know all that was and all that is and all that may have been but was not; nothing is hidden from them.[23]
- The Imams know all the revealed books in the languages that they were revealed.
- When Imams have the upper hand, they will judge as Prophet Dâwûd (David) used to do; they should not be questioned about the evidences of their judgments.
- None collected all the Qur'ân but the Imams.
- The only truth known to human beings is that which has been brought to them by the Imams, anything not coming directly from them is falsehood.

---

[21] Muhammad Ridâ Al-Mudhaffar, *`Aqâ'id Al-Imamîyah*, 95.

[22] Ayatollah Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah* (*Islamic Government*), pp. 91, 113.

[23] Khomeini says, "We do not imagine that the Imams could be forgetful or neglectful of anything, we believe that they encompass entirely the well-being of the Muslims."

- The Earth is entirely in the hands of the Imam.

Another Example of Exaggeration

In his book, *Hayâtul-Qulûb* (*Life of Hearts*), Al-Majlisî writes that the Prophet was once sitting while Al-Husayn was on his right thigh and his son Ibrâhîm on his left thigh. He would kiss this one and then that one. The Angel Jibrîl (Gabriel) was sent down and said, "Verily, your lord has sent me to tell you that they cannot live at the same time; choose one of them over the other, and sacrifice the second to the first." The Prophet looked at his son Ibrâhîm and wept. Then he said to Jibrîl, "I have sacrificed Ibrâhîm for Al-Husayn, and am content with the death of Ibrâhîm so that Al-Husayn may live and prosper."[24]

Similarities with the Christians: Atonement and Penance

The Shias' exaggerations about their Imams have led them to believe that loyalty toward the Imams is more important than prayer, Fasting, giving *Zakâh*, and Pilgrimage to Mecca. Al-Kulaynî tells us that Abû Ja`far said, "Islam is built on five things: Prayer, *Zakâh*, *Hajj*, Fasting, and loyalty toward the Prophet's Household."[25] Someone asked

[24] Al-Majlisî, *Hayâtul-Qulûb*, 2:593.
[25] In Shia books, this is called *wilayat* [*trans*].

him, "Which of these is the most important?" He said, "Loyalty toward the Prophet's Household."[26]

The Shia scholars say that whoever declares his allegiance to the Prophet's Household is among the people of Paradise. It does not matter what he has done in this world. Further, they claim that Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq said, "Allah had written a book two thousand years before He created all things and it remains with Him beneath the Throne. (It says) 'O Shias of the Family of Muhammad, I have forgiven you even before you have disobeyed Me. Whoever comes without having denied the Imamate of Muhammad's Household, I will admit him to Paradise, a mercy from Me.'"[27] The Shias have fabricated *hadîth*s indicating their superiority over other people. They claim that Allah created them from special clay, different from the clay all other human beings were made from. They went further claiming that Allah will not forgive anyone other than them and that they are the successful people on the Day of Resurrection.[28]

According to them, Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq said, "Allah has created us from the highest degree in Paradise and has also created the souls of our Shias from the highest degree in Paradise."[29] Fathul-Lâh Al-Kâshânî says in his book *Manhaj As-Sâdiqîn* (*Way of the Truthful*) that "the love for `Alî is a virtuous deed[30] that no wrong doing can wipe away. . . . Our love for the Household of the Prophet causes sins to fall like the leaves fall from

---

[26] Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 2:18-20; also Al-Majlisî, *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, 68:83-97 (the chapter is entitled, "No Deeds are Accepted except by Loyalty to the Prophet's Household").
[27] Al-Bahrânî, *Al-Burhân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân* 3:228.
[28] Al-Majlisî, *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, 68:1-83; also 98-149 and 149-199.
[29] Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 3:4; Al-Majlisî, *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, 52:12.
[30] Arabic: *hasanah* [*trans*].

a tree."[31] Al-Kulaynî says in *Al-Kâfî*, "The pen is lifted up (i.e., no deed, good or evil is recorded…)[32] from our Shias, even if they come with as many sins as there are drops of rain, or pebbles."[33] In the introduction to *Tafsîr Al-Burhân*, we are told that Allah said, "`Alî Ibn Abû T̲âlib is the My Proof to My creation. Whoever acknowledges this will not enter the Hellfire, even if he disobeyed Me, and no one will enter Paradise who denies this, even if he obeyed Me."[34] Finally, it is narrated that when a man told one of the Imams, "I love those who observe fasting but I do not fast, and I love those who observe prayer but I do not perform prayer." The Imam said, "You will be with those whom you love."[35]

A Response to these Accounts

If it is true that the mere love for Imams is an act of piety that cannot be wiped out by any sin, then what need is there to observe anything else in the *Sharî`ah*? Is the love for `Alî and the Imams more important to Allah than obedience to Him and fulfilling the obligations of His religion?

---

[31] Fath̲ul-Lâh Ibn Shukrul-Lâh Al-Kâshânî (d. 978/1570), *Minhâj As̲-S̲âdiqîn fî Ilzâm Al-Mukhâlifîn*, 8:110.

[32] *Rufi`a al-qalam* is an Arabic idiom that means to be "unaccountable for one's sins," it appears in a well-known *h̲adîth* where the Prophet said "*Rufi`a al-qalam `an* …" "No deed, good or evil is recorded for the insane until they come to reason, for a child until he comes of age, or for the sleeper until he awakes." [*trans*].

[33] Al-Kulaynî, *Us̲ûl Al-Kâfî*.

[34] Al-Bah̲rânî, *Al-Burhân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân*, 1: 23.

[35] Al-Kulaynî, *Us̲ûl Al-Kâfî*, p. 8.

If the mere love for Allah and His Messenger is not enough to protect the believer from chastisement, how could the love for `Alî alone, unsupported by any good deeds, not only save him from all punishment, but wipe out all his evil deeds? This belief diverts people from the principal purpose for which Allah created them and makes the love for `Alî, not the worship of Allah, the object of all creation. Allah has created us to do good deeds; He says, *{"[He] Who created death and life to test you [as to] which of you is best in deed... "}*[36]

`Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib: Hero of Islam and Pride of all the Muslims

According to the Sunnis, `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, the husband of Fâtimah, the father of Al-Hasan and Al-Husayn, was the hero of the Muslims and the source of their pride and self-respect. He was one of the greatest sons of Islam and a defender of the Prophet, even from an early age. To love him and his family is an important aspect of faith, to disparage them is an act of hypocrisy.

Yet, they (the Sunnis) do not agree with the Shias when they say that mere love for `Alî will wipe away sin, while no amount of good deeds can make up for hatred toward him. The Sunnis also do not believe that merely looking into the face of `Alî is an act of worship. The love that wipes away all sins is a Christian notion of forgiveness. They say their love for Christ will ensure the forgiveness of all their sins on the Day of Judgment, even without good deeds.

The Sunnis reject the quasi-divinity that the Shias have bestowed on `Alî. In *Tafsîr Al-Burhân*, we read that Allah said, "`Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib is My proof before all creation and My light . . . [he is] the custodian of My knowledge." In the same book, we read

[36] Qur'ân 67:2.

that Allah has created the heavens and the earth from the light of the Prophet, while the `*Arsh* (the Throne) and the *Kursî*[37] are created from the light of `Alî Ibn Abû T̲âlib.[38] Similarly, it is common for Shias to slap their knees after finishing prayer and say, *"Tâh Al-Amîn* (the Trustworthy (Angel) has gone astray)." This is to reproach the Angel Jibrîl who brought the Revelation to Muh̲ammad when he was supposed to take it to `Alî Ibn Abû T̲âlib, at least according to the Shias. That they do this is a matter of common knowledge, and had we not seen it ourselves, we would not have mentioned it.

The Sunnis also reject what some of the Shia scholars, such as Al-Kishshî, attribute to `Alî. They write that `Alî said, "I am the countenance of Allah, I am at the right hand of Allah, I am the first and the last, I am the ascendant and the intimate[39], I shall inherit the earth, I am the way of Allah."[40] The Shia scholars have exaggerated the status of `Alî even to the point Al-Mufîd said that Allah used to talk confidentially to `Alî.[41]

As such, we should learn a lesson when considering how the Christians started by only stretching the truth a little, but with time they continued to do this inflating their stories until they ended worshippers of Jesus instead of being worshippers of Allah.

[37] Chair or footstool; it is not to be confused with the *Al-`Arsh* (the Throne), which is infinitely higher and greater than *Al-Kursî*. See the Qur'ân: 2: 255. (*trans.*)

[38] Al-Bah̲rânî, *Al-Burhân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân*, 4:226.

[39] When these attributes are mentioned in such absolute way, especially in upper case, they refer to Allah, Exalted be He. (*trans.*)

[40] Al-Kashshî, *Ar-Rijâl*, 184.

[41] Muh̲ammad Ibn Muh̲ammad Ibn An-Nu`mân Al-Mufîd, *Al-Ikhtis̲âs̲* (*Specialization*); Khomeini praises this man and says that he was a *faqîh* [A knowledgeable scholar of Islamic jurisprudence who deduces the legal rulings from the sources of Islamic Law] and a *mujtahid* [A jurist qualified to attempt a reasoned or deduced solution for unprecedented legal problems] (see Ayatollah Khomeini, *Al-H̲ukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, 58). 33

Such fanaticism has even led some groups of Shias, such as the Nusayriyyah and the Druze, to worship `Alî, who they say is the Lord of the heavens and the earth. While the Twelve-Imam Shias theoretically say that these groups are disbelievers, in fact, they are in accordance with them from a practical point of view.

The Christians show excessive love for Jesus, but they go no further than this and do not follow what he taught. The important thing to their minds is to glorify him; they do not consider that anything they could do in this respect could be wrong. In this way, they have combined their love for him with their own desires. The point of religion is not to instill in a person an overwhelming love that clouds his mind and judgment. His love will not intervene on his behalf before his Lord. We see the love for Allah in obedience to Him, in following His Commandments. This is the evidence of true love, and its final witness. Such a love must be reciprocal, it cannot be one-sided. To demonstrate, while the Christians love the Messiah, he does not love them, because they have abandoned both reason and legitimacy through their exaggeration of his status. Likewise, the Jews love Moses, but he does not love them, for they have defied the Law that he brought them.

What the Prophet's Household said about Shia Extremism

Members of the Prophet's Household spoke of people who would make exaggerated claims about them. `Alî Ibnul-Husayn Zayn Al-`Âbidîn, the Fourth Imam, said "The Jews loved Ezra so much that they finally said [that he was the son of Allah]. But Ezra is not one of them and they have nothing to do with Ezra. The Christians loved Jesus so much that they finally said [that he is the son of Allah]. But Jesus is not one of them and they have nothing to do with Jesus. There will appear among our supporters

people who will love us so much that they will finally say about us what the Jews said about Ezra, and what the Christians say about Jesus. We have nothing to do with them, and they have nothing to so with us."[42]

`Alî also is reported to have said, "Two groups will find destruction because of me: One will exaggerate their love for me to the point that it leads them away from truth, and the other will exaggerate their hatred for me to such a degree that it leads them away from truth. The best of my supporters are those who are moderate." [43]

Al-Kashshî, a Shia authority on *Hadîth*, reports that Ja`far As-Sâdiq said, "We certainly are not free of those who will attribute false reports about us. . . . We have no greater enemy than those who take advantage of our name."[44]

Only Hypocrites Dislike the Prophet's Household

The Sunnis obey the Prophet, who said, "I adjure you in the Name of Allah to look after my household." They believe that to speak ill of them is evidence of hypocrisy. They also consider that `Â'ishah is a member of his household,[45] and whatever hurts her hurts the

[42] Al-Kashshî, *Ar-Rijâl*, p.111.
[43] Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 2:8.
[44] Al-Kashshî, *Ar-Rijâl*, 257 and 259.
[45] *Ahlul-Bayt*; There is much evidence to support this position in the Qur'ân. For example, the wife of Al-`Azîz says to her husband what came in the verse which reads, *{"What is the recompense of one who intended evil for your wife but that he be imprisoned or a painful punishment?"}* (Qur'ân 12: 25) Similarly, when the Angels spoke to the wife of Ibrâhîm they said, *{"…May the mercy of Allah and His blessings be upon you, people of the house…"}* (Qur'ân 11: 73) Allah also says, addressing the wives of the Prophet, *{"Allah intends only to remove from you the impurity [of sin], O people of the [Prophet's] household, and to purify*

Prophet. To defame `Â'ishah is to defame the Prophet since Allah has said, *{"Evil words are for evil men (or evil women for evil men), and evil men are [subjected] to evil words (or evil men for evil women). And good words are for good men (or good women for good men), and good men are [an object] of good words (or good men for good women)."}*[46] Is it possible that the Prophet would take evil woman into his house and that Allah would leave him in this situation? The books of the Shias are not free of accusations against `Â'ishah and Hafsah. For example, they say that the Prophet once pointed to `Â'ishah's house and said, "Disbelief springs from this place."[47] They also say that `Â'ishah and Hafsah plotted to poison the Prophet.[48] How is this possible for them to honor the Prophet and his household while curse his wives, whom Allah has called "Mothers of the Believers?" Allah says, *{"The Prophet is more worthy of the believers than themselves, and*

---

you with [extensive] purification."} (33: 33) While some people have said that this cannot refer to the wives of the Prophet since the grammatical form used in this verse is masculine (*`ankum*) and assert that if it had been meant to refer to the wives of the Prophet, it would have been feminine (*`ankunna*), it does, in fact refer to them. This is clear when we consider that masculine verb forms do refer to feminine subjects in other verses of the Qur'ân. In the verse 28: 29, Moses says, to his "*ahl* (i.e., family)", "Stay here" (i.e., *imkuthû* - second person masculine plural). According to Shia sources, this refers to Moses' wife, even though the verb is masculine. See also Al-Fadl Ibnul-Hasan At-Tubrasî, *Majma` Al-Bayân li `Ulûm Al-Qur'ân*, 4: 211, 4: 250; Al-Qummî's *Tafsîr*, 2: 139; Al-Kâshânî, *Manhaj As-Sâdiqîn*, 7: 95. Allah tells Lût (Lot), *{"Indeed, we will save you and your family [**ahl**], except your wife"}* (Qur'ân 29: 33). This is evidence that the word *ahl* includes wife, for if Lût's wife had believed, she would have been saved together with the rest of Lût's family (***ahl***), while if she had not disbelieved, she would not have been expressly excluded from them.

[46] Qur'ân 24: 26.

[47] Al-Husayn Al-`Âmilî, *Wusûl Al-Akiyâr ilâ Usûl Al-Akhbâr*, p. 79.

[48] Al-Majlisî, *Hayâtul-Qulûb*, 2:700.

his wives are [in the position of] ***their mothers****… "}*[49] How can anyone who claims to be a believer reject that `Â'ishah is his mother in faith, when this is clearly stated in the Qur'ân? What are we to think when they quote the Qur'ân saying, *{"Allah presents an example of those who disbelieved: the wife of Noah and the wife of Lot… "}*[50] and use this to prove that `Â'ishah and Hafsah had apostatized? Is this not much like the hypocrisy of `Abdullâh Ibn Saba' who accused the wives of the Prophet of perversion and corruption? The Shias' doctrines about the Prophet's family are difficult to comprehend, for while they exaggerate the status of some of its members to the point of declaring their divinity, they degrade others and curse them. They even deny that some of them are members of the Prophet's Household at all.

[49] Qur'ân 33: 6.
[50] Qur'ân 66: 10.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE COMPANIONS OF THE PROPHET

The hearts of the Sunnis are not burdened in any way for the Companions of the Prophet. They believe that the dignity of the Prophet's Companions places them above all other people in honor. They follow the Prophet's advice for he said, "Do not speak ill of my Companions."[1] Allah says in the Qur'ân, *{"Allah has already forgiven the Prophet and the Muhâjirûn*[2] *and the Anṣâr*[3] *... "}*[4] Following this, no one ever spoke ill of them again. Insults and curses are not characteristic of pious believers. This cannot be said except by the hypocrites who, in the time of the Prophet, used to slander and ridicule the believers, who gave themselves freely to acts of charity. Allah says about such hypocrites, *{"Those who criticize the contributors among the believers concerning*

---

[1] Al-Bukhârî and Muslim.
[2] The Emigrants from Mecca to Medina.
[3] The Supporters of the Prophet in Medina; the inhabitants of Medina who had accepted Islam and supported the Prophet and all the *Muhâjirûn* upon their arrival there.
[4] Qur'ân 9: 117.

[their] charities and [criticize] the ones who find nothing [to spend] except their effort, so they ridicule them - Allah will ridicule them, and they will have a painful punishment."}[5]

The Shias' Position on the Prophet's Companions

The Shias insist on their opposition to the Prophet's Companions to the point of saying that all but three of them abandoned Islam after the death of the Prophet. The three they redeem are Abû Dharr, Salmân Al-Fârisî, and Al-Miqdâd. According to them, whoever doubts that the Prophet's Companions abandoned Islam is a disbeliever.[6] The book *Al-Kâfî* tells us that "Abû Bakr and `Umar both died without having repented, or regretting for wronging `Alî. Because of this, according to Al-Kulaynî, Allah curses them, and so do the Angels and all mankind.[7] Al-Kulaynî explains that the verse, *{"Indeed, those who have believed then disbelieved, then believed, then disbelieved, and then increased in disbelief - never will Allah forgive them, nor will He guide them to a way."}*[8] was revealed about 'these two fellows'[9], who believed in the Messenger, but then disbelieved when they did not swear their allegiance to `Alî. Their disbelief increased when they accepted that others

[5] Qur'ân 9: 79.
[6] Al-Kulaynî, *U_s_ul Al-Kâfî*, 2: 245; Al-Majlisî, *_H_ayâtul-Qulûb*, 2: 640; also Al-`Ayashî's *Tafsîr*, 1: 199; Mu_h_ammad Murta_d_â Al-Kâshânî, *Tafsîr A_s_-_S_âfî*, 1:389; Al-Sayyid Hâshim Al-Ba_h_rânî, *Al-Burhân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân*, 1:319; *Tafsîr Nûr Ath-Thaqalayn*, 1:396; Ja`far Ibn Mu_h_ammad Ibn Quluya, *Al-Ikhti_s_â_s_*, 4,5; *As-Sarâ'ir* (*Secrets*), 468. *Tujjâr Al-Aswâr* (*Merchants of Walls*) 22:345, 352, 44
[7] Al-Kulaynî, *U_s_ûl Al-Kâfî*, 8:246.
[8] Qur'ân 4:136.
[9] That is to say, Abû Bakr and `Umar according to A_s_-_S_âfî in his comment on *Al-Kâfî*.

swear allegiance to them rather than to `Alî. Such people cannot claim even the smallest amount of faith."[10]

The Shia scholars claim that `Umar was the illegitimate son of a woman named Sihâk and `Abdul-Muttalib.[11] As for Abû Bakr, they say he was Satan's companion and that he and his friend `Umar were both hypocrites, unjust and liars; whoever accepted that they were the legitimate successors of the Prophet will be straying and will die as those who died in the Pre-Islamic Period of Ignorance.[12] `Uthmân, the Shias say, was a straying and an accursed person.[13]

To the Shias, these three are the most despised of the Prophet's Companions and they spare no effort to insult them. Al-Majlisî devoted an entire chapter in his book entitled "the Apostasy of the Three, their Alleged Hypocrisy, and the Disgracefulness of their Behavior."[14] He also said that whoever believed that `Uthmân was unjustly killed has committed a greater sin than those who worshipped the calf.[15] It is a natural tendency of those who believe whatever they please to exaggerate the things they like and the things they dislike. The strange thing is that while the Shias falsely accuse Mu`âwiyah of ordering the cursing of `Alî by preachers on pulpits, and claim that this

---

[10] Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 240.
[11] Ibn Tâwûs, *At-Tarâ'if fî Ma`rifât At-Tawâ'if*, 401; Ni`matul-Lâh Ibn Muhammad Al-Jazâ'irî, *Al-Anwâr Al-Nu`mâniyyah fî Bayân Ma`rifat An-Nash'ah Al-Insâniyyah*, 1:61; Muhammad Al-Hasan Al-`Alamî, *Dâ'irât Al-Ma`ârif Ash-Shî`iyyah*, 29:23.
[12] At-Tâwûsî, `Abdullâh Ibn Mûsâ Ibn Ja`far Ibn Tâwûs At-Tâwûsî, *At-Tarâ'if fî Ma`rifat At-Tawâ'if*, p. 401; Al-Majlisî, *Haqqul-Yaqîn* (*Absolute Truth*), p. 204.
[13] Al-Maqdisî Al-Ardibîlî, *Hadîqat Ash-Shî`ah* (*Garden of the Shias*), p. 275.
[14] Al-Majlisî, *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, 8:208-252.
[15] Al-Majlisî, *Haqqul-Yaqîn*, p. 270.

is an example of his evilness, they themselves curse Abû Bakr and `Umar every day and see nothing wrong in it.

A Continuing Tradition

The Iranian Revolution had raised hopes of change, and some people expected that books published more recently in Iran would not be so offensive as the old books were; the books which the scholars of Shia avoid discussing. But it does not seem like the situation has changed, and the books the Shias are publishing today still follow the well-established tradition of their old scholars. Books such as Muhammad Ar-Radiyy Ar-Radawî's *They Attributed lies to the Shia,*[16] Muhammad At-Tîjânî As-Samâwî's *Then I was Guided,*[17] and *Ask the People of Knowledge,*[18] and *With the Truthful*[19], and Sheikh Al-Ansârî's book in which he describes the Prophet's Companions as liars and enemies of Allah and His Messenger.

The Shia centers throughout the world have translated the book *Then I was Guided* and it is now in print in several languages and widely distributed. Its author describes his conversion from Sufism, which he describes as far from the *Sunnah* of the Prophet. His road ended with Shiism. A quick glance at his book gives us an idea of how Allah "**guided**" him to insult the Companions and the wives of the Prophet. He says for example:

[16] Muhammad Ar-Radiyy Ar-Radawî, *Kadhabû `alâ Ash-Shî`ah.*
[17] Muhammad At-Tîjânî As-Samâwî, *Thumma Ihtadayt.*
[18] Muhammad At-Tîjânî As-Samâwî, *Fas'alû Ahladh-Dhikr*
[19] Muhammad At-Tîjânî As-Samâwî, *Ma`â As-Sâdiqîn.*

"The Companions angered the Prophet, with their bad manners and forward behavior toward him and because they did not show him proper respect. . . . They were stubborn, and argued with him . . . and challenged the commands of their Lord. They placed themselves above the Prophet.[20]

They [the Companions] do not deserve any respect . . . . . . They took advantage of weak-minded people to spread invented *h̲adîth*s and reports about their own praiseworthiness."[21]

He continues, saying "`Umar does not abstain from committing sins nor does he fear Allah," "The Companions turned back on their heels (i.e. apostatized), so they deserve neither Allah's reward nor His forgiveness," "They (i.e. the Companions) were slack in *jihad* and inclined to worldly pleasures," "They turned back on their heels and innovated freely and shamelessly in religion, saying, 'We hear and disobey.'"[22]

He also claims that the Companions, including `Â'ishah, had changed the *Sunnah* of the Prophet and that they admitted doing so.

At-Tîjânî's other books, *With the Truthful* and *Ask the People of Knowledge*, are written in the same vein. This is because the essence of Shiism is based on insulting the Companions of the Prophet. Without this, their doctrines are without value or purpose.

---

[20] Muh̲ammad At-Tîjânî As-Samâwî, *Thumma Ihtadayt*, pp. 88-89.
[21] Muh̲ammad At-Tîjânî As-Samâwî, *Thumma Ihtadayt*, pp. 96, 100, 101.
[22] Ibid., pp. 104-107.

This insolent has lost his way and mistaken bitterness and hatred for guidance. His scant regard for those who bore Islam on their shoulders, and his insults to the wives of the Prophet bear witness to his lack of understanding. Such bitterness has nothing to do with guidance. He has merely left the falsehood of Sufism and exchanged it for the falsehood of Shiism. Being a Sufi, he was already near to Shiism since this is the mother of Sufism. Indeed, Sufism itself is a manifestation of Shiism, as Ibn Khaldûn said in *Al-Muqaddimah* (*The Introduction*). Both of them are built on false, distorted, and twisted beliefs. These beliefs led them to bury their dead in mosques, to build spectacular tombs and mausolea, and to sanctify their Imams and spiritual leaders. For them, the Imams are infallible and have absolute control over the universe. The Shias and Sufis believe the dead will come to the aid of the living. It would have been more proper for him to refer to the thousands of books of the Sunnis refuting what the Sufis compiled and judging their deviation, but instead Muhammad At-Tîjânî kept his nose in the dust and followed his desire.

The Shias and the Sufis both defy Allah's Words, *{"And [He revealed] that the masjids are for Allah, so do not invoke with Allah anyone."}*[23] They are both up to their necks in shrines and tombs and frightful innovations. Allah said, *{"Indeed, those you [polytheists] call upon besides Allah are servants [i.e. creations] like you. So call upon them and let them respond to you, if you should be truthful."}*[24] He also said, *{"If you invoke them, they do not hear your supplication; and if they heard, they would not respond to you… "}* [25]

---

[23] Qur'ân 72:18.
[24] Qur'ân 7:193.
[25] Qur'ân 35:14.

Muhammad At-Tîjânî's book is just another example of the impossibility of reconciling the Sunnis and the Shias as long as the Shias insist on insulting the Companions and Mothers of the Believers (i.e., the wives of the Prophet). Moreover, they slander them and accuse them of perverting religion, distorting the Qur'ân, and conspiring against the Prophet.

The goal of unity is to bind hearts together in mutual affection. But can two hearts, the first of which is filled with love for the Companions, and the second is filled with hatred for them, be reconciled? This book of At-Tîjânî is another proof that the Shias today are not different from their predecessors in this respect and that they still insist on insulting the Companions. Shall the sincere Muslims then become conscious of this?[26]

History is witness to the Companions of the Prophet, who struggled with their property and their lives and their children. They liberated the oppressed countries and spread Islam far and wide. Who else but the Companions of the Prophet have done such things?

Thoughtful and reasonable Shias recognize the mighty achievements of the Companions of the Prophet. For example, Sheikh Muhammad Hasan Âl Kâshif Al-Ghitâ' relates that "When `Alî saw that Abû Bakr and `Umar were making a supreme effort to spread the Word of Allah, he saw that they were preparing armies and sending them out in the service of Allah. They were not arrogant and not despotic. So, `Alî swore allegiance to them,[27] and submitted himself to their authority."[28]

---

[26] Not even Khomeini was capable of softening his position toward the Companions. He falsely describes the Companion Samurah Ibn Jundub as a liar who reports narrations that degrades `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib. (see *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p. 131).

[27] Arabic: *bâya`* [*trans*].

Differences among the Companions

Allah spared our hands from the conflict that arose between the Companions, so why should we not spare our tongues from it? Allah will not ask us about what happened between them. Thus, we read in the Qur'ân:

> *{"That was a nation which has passed on. It will have [the consequence of] what it earned, and you will have what you have earned. And you will not be asked about what they used to do."}*

The root of the conflict between the Shias and the Sunnis lies in the Shias' abuse of the Companions. This led them to insult the wives of the Prophet, to claim that the Qur'ân was distorted, and to claim the notion of Returning[29]. Once they arrived at this point, they could refuse to accept any *hadîth* reported on the authority of a Companion [claiming that they had apostatized after the Prophet]. When they said the legitimate succession of `Alî and his descendants to the caliphate is supported by the Qur'ân, they were asked to produce this evidence. They could not do this, so they accused the Companions of removing these verses from the Qur'ân.

---

[28] Muhammad Hasan Âl Kâshif, *Asl Ash-Shî`ah wa Usûluhâ* (*The Origin of the Shias and their Sources*), p. 91.

[29] Some of the Shia claim that Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Al-`Askarî, the Twelfth Imam, is hiding in a cave in Samara and will return by the end of this world while others claim that `Alî himself will return.

So long as this obstacle to unity remains, no reconciliation will ever be possible between these two groups. Any attempt to bring them closer must fail; it does not matter how many conferences are held, or how many fine words are spoken. The Shias' hatred for the Companions of the Prophet, and their insistence on insulting them, proves the falsehood of their doctrines.

Who Started Insulting the Companions?

According to An-Nûbakhtî, one of the most respected of the Shia scholars, the first person to insult the Companions was a former Jew called `Abdullâh Ibn Saba'. An-Nûbakhtî said that `Abdullâh Ibn Saba' started abusing the Prophet's Companions, especially Abû Bakr, `Umar and `Uthmân. Covering himself with a pretense of Islam, he started conspiring against them. An-Nûbakhtî adds, "`Abdullâh Ibn Saba' was one of those who openly insulted Abû Bakr, `Umar and `Uthmân and other Companions. He disassociated himself from them and claimed that `Alî had ordered him to do so. When `Alî heard this, he sent for Ibn Saba', who Saba' admitted saying this. Thereon, `Alî ordered him to be killed, but people objected to this and said, 'Would you kill a man because he calls people to love you?'"

According to An-Nûbakhtî, "Ibn Saba', while still a Jew, used to say that Yûsha` Ibn Nûn (Joshua) was the rightful successor of Mûsâ (Moses). When he converted to Islam, he started saying that `Alî was the rightful successor of Prophet Muhammad. He was the first to say that it was a religious obligation to support the Imamate of `Alî. It was because of Ibn Saba' that the opposers of the Shia say that Shiism comes from the Judaism."[30]

[30] An-Nûbakhtî, *Firaq Ash-Shî`ah*, (An-Najaf, Iraq), pp. 44-45.

There is another account to explain why the Shias are called *Râfidah* (Rejectionists). Mirzâ Taqî relates,

> Zayd Ibn `Alî, a member of the Prophet's Household, disapproved of the Shias' insulting Abû Bakr and `Umar. They asked him, "What is your opinion of them?"
> "I only think well of them," He said.
> "Then you are not one of us," they told Zayd, and rejected him.
> "Today they rejected us." Zayd said, and ever since, they have been called "*râfidah*" [those who reject].

Since then, Imam Zayd called all Shia fanatics who insulted the Companions *râfidah*.[31]

Once `Abdullâh Ibn Saba' came to `Alî instigating him against Abû Bakr and `Umar, but `Alî scolded him, saying, "Have you dedicated yourself to such things?"

Do the Shias then follow the example of `Alî who wanted to kill `Abdullâh Ibn Saba' for insulting the Companions? On whose side are the Shias today? On the side of `Alî, who was willing to kill a man for hating Abû Bakr, `Umar and `Uthmân, or are they on the side of Ibn Saba' who set the example for those who insult the Companions of the Prophet, his relatives by marriage, and his wives?

---

[31] Mirza Taqî, *Nâsikh At-Twârîkh*, 3:590.

CHAPTER SIX

THE IMAMATE ACCORDING TO THE SHIAS

Sheikh Muhammad Hasan Âl Kâshif Al-Ghitâ' explains that "the Imamate is a divine office like that of the Prophethood. Just as Allah chooses whomever He pleases for the Prophethood, He chooses whomever He pleases for the Imamate, and He commands His Prophet to designate his successor."[1] The Shias believe that Allah appointed `Alî and his sons to the Imamate[2] and say Abû Bakr seized the caliphate after the death of the Prophet. Abû Bakr was succeeded by `Umar and then by `Uthmân. The Shias say these three men denied the rights of `Alî and his descendants, and usurped the caliphate due to him. According to some of them, whoever believes that these three legitimately ruled the Muslims is defiantly disobedient or disbeliever according to others. For example, Al-Majlisî says that "The Twelve-Imam Shias agree that whoever denies the Imamate of any of the [Twelve] Imams and rejects showing obedience to what Allah obligated

---

[1] Âl Kâshif, *Asl Ash-Shî`ah wa Usûluhâ*, p. 58; Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p. 39.
[2] Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*,1:287.

(concerning their Imamate), is a disbeliever who will abide eternally in the Hellfire." Al-Kulaynî believes disobedience to `Alî is (an act of) disbelief and that to accept the leadership of someone other than `Alî is (an act of) polytheism.[3]

Qur'anic Support for the Imamate was "Distorted"

Some Shias claim that there was evidence for the Imamate of `Alî in the Qur'ân. They hold the belief that the Companions removed this from the text because it mentioned `Alî by name, and designated him successor to the Prophet. One of such verses is 5:67:

> "O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord [**in the matter of `Alî**], and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His Message."

The Shias say that when this verse was revealed, the Messenger of Allah said to `Alî, "Had I not conveyed what I had been ordered to covey about your succession (Imamate), my deeds would have been in vain."[4]

It appears that Khomeini also believed these words were removed from the Qur'ân, since he said, "We believe that the Prophet appointed his successor, and he already did. Had he not done so, he would not have conveyed His Message."[5] He also believed that Allah had prescribed in the Qur'ân to obey the Imams. He quotes the Qur'ân, *{"O you who have believed, obey Allah and obey the Messenger and those in authority among*

[3] Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 1:45, 52; see also Al-Majlisî, *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, 23:390.
[4] Al-Huaizi, *Tafsîr Nûr Ath-Thaqalayn*, 1:653.
[5] Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, pp. 19, 23.

you… "}[6] Yet, how can we obey someone who is hiding in a cave in Samara? Could a reasonable person buy some fish which is still in water?

Reviewing the Claim of Designating the Imams

The belief that the designation of `Alî[7] and his descendants as successors to the Prophet is mentioned in the Qur'ân raises other difficulties:

1. Allah commanded the Muslims to consult one another as He said describing the believers, *{"… and established prayer and whose affair is [determined by] consultation among themselves… "}*[8] The Caliphate is, undoubtedly, an affair of the Muslims, and neither the Qur'ân nor the *Sunnah* provides any text to say who was to succeed the Prophet. Ash-Sharîf Al-Murtadâ confirms this in the book *Nahjul-Balâghah*. He writes that `Alî said to Mu`âwiyah, "Consultation is the right of the *Muhâjirûn* and the *Ansâr* if they gather and appoint a man to be (Imam), then that is what is pleasing to Allah."[9] This indicates that whatever pleases the *Muhâjirûn* and the *Ansâr* will please Allah as well.

`Alî then asked Mu`âwiyah to swear allegiance to him and told him, "The people who swore allegiance to Abû Bakr, `Umar, and `Uthmân, are those who swore allegiance to

---

[6] Ibid. 24.

[7] Khomeini says, "Allah had spoken to the Prophet in a revelation and told him who was to succeed him and what he was to do; the Prophet did as he was told and appointed `Alî, Commander of the Faithful Believers, as Caliph. (*Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p. 43.)

[8] Qur'ân, 42:38.

[9] Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 3:8.

me as well."[10] This proves that `Alî recognized the legality of the Caliphate of Abû Bakr, and of `Umar, since they had been chosen by the majority.

2. `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib swore allegiance to the three Caliphs who preceded him. Everyone agrees about this although the Shias say he initially opposed them. `Alî's oath of allegiance to Abû Bakr, `Umar and `Uthmân is evidence against those who say they support his claim.

As illustrated before, Sheikh Âl Kâshif Al-Ghitâ' said, "When `Alî saw that Abû Bakr and `Umar were making a supreme effort to spread the Word of Allah. He saw that they were preparing armies and sending them out in the service of Allah. They were not arrogant and not despotic. So, `Alî swore allegiance to them, and submitted himself to their authority."

Even the annotator of *Nahjul-Balâghah* said that `Alî acknowledged that Abû Bakr was a better choice for the post of Caliphate, for he said when he made his oath of allegiance to Abû Bakr, "In our view, Abû Bakr is the most deserving person to this office. He was the companion (of the Prophet) in the Cave,[11] we know his status, and the Messenger of Allah (PBUH) appointed him to lead the people in prayer while the Prophet was still alive."[12]

Al-Majlisî and Al-Kulaynî say that whoever believes that Abû Bakr and `Umar were legitimate successors of the Prophet is a disbeliever. So, what do they say about `Alî,

---

[10] Ibid., 3:7; Al-Mufîd, *Al-Irshâd*, 31.

[11] This refers to his remaining in Mecca with the Prophet after all the Muslims had emigrated, and of his accompanying the Prophet as he emigrated and hiding with him in a cave in the hills above Mecca while Quraysh searched for them far and wide.

[12] `Abdul-Hamîd Ibn Hibatul-Lâh Ibn Muhammad Ibn Abul-Hadîd, *Sharh Nahjul-Balâghah*, 1:132.

who raised his right hand and swore to obey their leadership? Do they not consider `Alî to be infallible and far above cowardice?

`Alî's Oath to Abû Bakr and `Umar is Irrefutable Proof

The Shia scholars have busily tried to explain their way out of `Alî's oaths to Abû Bakr and `Umar. The most important of their excuses are:

First excuse: `Alî made these oaths out of fear that otherwise, Islam would be lost. The response to this is that Islam at the time of Abû Bakr and `Umar was in its golden age and had spread to Bukhara[13] in the East along the length of the North African cost to the West.

Second excuse: `Alî made these oaths only to show agreement while he hid his displeasure with their leadership in his heart. This claim is even more unpleasant than the first since it depicts `Alî as a two-faced, cowering, muddled man, who says what he does not believe. This cannot convince anyone who knows about `Alî's courage and bravery, and his powerful commitment to truth. Al-Murtadâ narrated many accounts in *Nahjul-Balâghah* confirming this. `Alî said, "I am from a people who never fear the blame of the blamers as long as Allah's Sake is concerned."[14]

If his oath was only as empty words, why was he a minister to the three caliphs during the twenty-five years of their caliphates? It is hard to believe that he maintained this ruse throughout such a long period. Was his giving his daughter in marriage to `Umar also

---

[13] A city of southern Uzbekistan west of Samarkand. It is one of the oldest cultural and trade centers of Asia and was capital of the former emirate of Bukhara from the 16th to the 19th century. [*trans.*]

[14] Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, p. 159.

part of this deception? Was his naming three of his sons Abû Bakr, `Umar, and `Uthmân also part of it?

`Alî was one of the most courageous people in history. The Sunnis believe that it is gravely insulting to say that he acted against his conscience out of fear. Can the Shias really love `Alî and still accuse him of such a thing?

Further, `Alî Ibn Abû T̲âlib rejected the Caliphate when it was offered to him, saying, "Pass me by and choose another, for it is better that I be a minister to you, than a prince over you."[15] Besides, when they made the oath to him after `Uthmân's murder he said, "By Allah, I had no desire for the Caliphate, and no ambition to power, but you have called me to it and forced it upon me."[16]

Judging from these reports, it does not seem that `Alî considered he had been appointed to the Imamate by the text of the Qur'ân. If this was so, how could he has said, "Pass me by and choose another" and, "By Allah, I had no desire for the Caliphate?" How could he have sworn allegiance to Abû Bakr and `Umar and `Uthmân? This would have been in defiance of the divine text, had it existed and a manifest contradiction to the *h̲adîth* of Ghadîr Khumm[17], if authentic.

Everyone acknowledges that Al-H̲asan renounced the Imamate in favor of Mu`âwiyah. The Prophet predicted this when he said, 'Verily, this son of mine is a chief [*sayyid*], and

---

[15] Ibid. 181-182.

[16] Ibid. 222.

[17] The word *ghadîr* is the Arabic equivalent of "brook"; it is the name of a place between Mecca and Medina where there is a brook. (*trans.*)

Allah will make peace between two great groups of Muslims through him."[18] The question remains, why did Al-H̲asan renounce the Caliphate in favor of Mu`âwiyah? The story is commonly told in the Shia books. These also mention that Sulaymân Ibn S̲urad an impor tant supporter of `Alî used to insult Al-H̲asan for this and said to him, "Peace be upon you, "humiliator of the believers' (*mudhil al-mu'minîn*) instead of Commander of the Faithful (*amîr al-mu'minîn*).

Criticizing Al-H̲asan for his abdication to Mu`âwiyah contradicts the Shia doctrine of the infallibility of the Imams. The Shias consider the words and deeds of their Imams as binding to people to follow. Controversy over the succession seems to have been closed with `Alî's swearing allegiance to the three Caliphs and Al-H̲asan's abdication to Mu`âwiyah. The alleged divine appointment of the Imam should have been settled by the willingness of `Alî and Al-H̲asan to acknowledge and follow the leadership of another. Why then must the Shias insist upon something that their Imams have renounced?

A Nation that Passed Away

What is the use of talking about the Caliphate and arguing about it? What is the use of returning again to a discussion of an issue that is long dead? Can there be any good reason for us to continue to live in the shadow of these events today, to root around in the past in search of something that could not benefit us now? Is it reasonable for us to spend our time arguing about who was the most worthy of the caliphate, while all of them are long dead? Is

[18] Al-Bukhârî and others; Nâs̲rud-Dîn Al-Albânî, *Irwâ' Al-Ghalîl* (*Quenching Thirst*), *h̲adîth* No. 1597. The Arabic word *sayyid* is used today as an honorific title for the direct descendants of the Prophet. The original meaning of the word is "master" or "lord". [*trans.*]

it possible for us to turn back the pages of history and give the reins of power to those the Shias wish would have ruled? Is their harping on these things not really a provocation of the devil. Satan only hopes to smash the unity of the Muslims, to rip the Islamic community apart, and to incite even more dissension and discord.

If the Shias truly seek the unity of the Muslims and the revival of its former glory, they should abandon these divisive claims, which are not more than memories. Will they never desist from their annual display of theatrics at `Âshûrâ' (the tenth of Mu<u>h</u>arram), which agitates the hearts of the members of our nation and set them one against the other, year after year? They resurrect old hatreds and animosities, and vainly return to settle old accounts!

Truth was with `Alî and his Opponents were Wrong

As for the conflict between `Alî and Mu`âwiyah, the Sunnis agree that `Alî Ibn Abû <u>T</u>âlib was correct to fight for his right. Mu`âwiyah, his supporters, and those who fought beside him, were wrong to challenge `Alî.

We challenge the Shias to come up with a single Sunni book that says `Alî was wrong and the caliphate should rightly have gone to Mu`âwiyah. We are ready to provide lists of hundreds of books by the Sunni scholars all declaring that Mu`âwiyah was wrong to rebel against the Commander of the Faithful, `Alî Ibn Abû <u>T</u>âlib. The Shias are unjustified in calling the Sunnis conspirators (*nawâ<u>s</u>ib*).[19] The epitaph is based on the

[19] This is what the Shias call the Sunnis, whom they claim conspired against the House of the Prophet. Ni`matul-Lâh Al-Jazâ'irî mentions that the Shias regard the "*nawâ<u>s</u>ib*" as disbelievers, and impure, according to the consensus of the Twelve-Imam Shia scholars. He goes further saying that [the *nawâ<u>s</u>ib*] are worse than the Jews and the Christians, and that one of their

belief that the Sunnis supported Mu`âwiyah against `Alî. They also call the Sunnis "Umayyads." These are injustices they will be called to account for on the Day of Judgment.

The First Conflict was Political

The conflict between `Alî and Mu`âwiyah was purely political, yet afterwards it began to take the form of doctrinal deviations. The Shias finally formed an independent sect and split themselves away from the main body of the Muslims. They developed their own approaches to the study of the principles and branches of the *Sharî`ah, Fiqh,* Creed, and rules of inheritance.

However, was the conflict between `Alî and Mu`âwiyah about these things? Or Did both parties share a single belief they both had taken from the Prophet? Mu`âwiyah, in fact, insisted to pursue the murderers of `Uthmân, but `Alî believed that caution and deliberation were necessary to diffuse a potentially explosive situation that took the shape of a dissension. `Alî's opinion was, certainly, the correct approach, and those who differed with him were mistaken. In this account, related by the Shia sources, `Alî explains:

"When we first encountered the Syrians[20] it was clear that Islam was our common faith. We had not exceeded them at all, neither in faith in Allah nor in belief in His

---

characteristics is their "preference of other men than `Alî for the Imamate (i.e., the caliphate)"; (see *Al-Anwâr An-Nu`mâniyyah*, 2:207-207).

[20] Mu`âwiyah's forces; he was at the time governor of Syria [*trans*].

Messenger, and they had not exceeded us either. We only differed about the avenging of the blood of `Uthmân."[21]

[21] Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 3:114.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE MUTUAL LOVE BETWEEN `ALÎ AND THE COMPANIONS

As we saw in the previous chapter, there is no support for the Shia claim that bitterness and hatred arose between `Alî and the Companions of the Prophet. `Alî used to praise them in death, and grieve for their loss saying:

> "Where are those who were called to Islam and answered the call, who recited the Qur'ân and lived by the recitation, who drew their swords and went to the far corners of the earth? Where are those whose eyes were reddened from weeping, whose bellies were hollow from fasting, whose voices were hoarse from supplicating their Lord? Where are those who were gaunt from lack of sleep, whose faces were drawn with the fear of Allah? These were my brothers and companions of the road who passed away. Indeed, it is my right to long for them and to bite my lips at their loss."[1]

---

[1] Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, p. 235.

What best shows the good relationship between `Alî and the Prophet's Companions is the marriage of his daughter, Umm Kulthûm,[2] to `Umar Ibnul-Khattâb, as confirmed in the Shia books. Besides, when `Umar asked `Alî's advice on whether he should go himself on the campaign against the Byzantines, `Alî told him, "You are the citadel of the Arabs, their reference, their refuge, and the buttress of the Muslims. If the non-Arabs were to see you tomorrow, they would say, 'This is the source of the Arab's (strength). Should we get rid of him, we would relieve ourselves [from this threat].'"[3] Thereon, `Umar did not accompany them on the campaign.

The Shia accounts also report that `Alî said:

> "I saw the Companions of the Prophet. I know of no one else like them. They would greet the morning dust-faced and disheveled, having spent [part of] the night in prostration and standing in prayer, now faces to the earth, now faces uplifted. It was as if they were standing on hot coals when they recalled the approach of the Hour of Reckoning, and they were bleary-eyed from prostrating. When Allah was mentioned, their eyes would be welled up with tears and their cheeks sodden. From fear of Allah's punishment and in the hope of His reward they would rock like a tree in a tempest."[4]

[2] This marriage gives the lie to the malicious fabrications of those who claim that `Umar Ibnul-Khattâb kicked Fâtimah until she miscarried. Would anyone agree that the man who beat one's pregnant wife, causing her to miscarry should marry his daughter and become his son-in-law? Would one then name one's son after this man? Other Shia sources give the name of the man who did that to Fâtimah as Qunfudh, not `Umar. (see *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, 43:197-200).

[3] Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 2:18, 20.

[4] Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, pp. 182-189.

`Alî used to say about `Uthmân, "[Some] people insulted him[5], but I was one of the *Muhâjirûn* who sought to please him most."[6]

The Position of `Alî's Sons on the Companions

At-Tubrasî reports that Imam Muhammad Al-Bâqir said, "I do not deny the merits of `Umar, but Abû Bakr was greater."[7]

A woman came to Ja`far As-Sâdiq – the Six Imam – and asked him about Abû Bakr and `Umar; whether to give them her loyalty.

"Yes," he said.

"And when I meet my Lord, shall I say that you told me to follow them?" she inquired.

Again, he said, "Yes."[8]

Besides, once a man was astonished to hear Muhammad Ibn `Alî [a man from the Prophet's Household] call Abû Bakr "As-Siddîq" (the truthful). "Do you call him 'truthful?'" he asked. "Yes, 'truthful'. May Allah not accept the truthfulness of whoever denies it, not in this world nor in the Hereafter,"[9] said Muhammad Ibn `Alî.

Further, according to an account related by Al-Mas`ûdî, when `Uthmân was murdered, he was sitting reading from the Qur'ân. His wife jumped up and began to scream, "They have killed the Emir of the Believers!" Al-Hasan and Al-Husayn came

---

5 As done nowadays by some Shias.
6 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 2:3.
7 At-Tubrasî, *Al-Ihtijâj*, p. 230.
8 Al-Kulaynî Muhammad Ibn Ya`qûb Al-Kulaynî Ar-Râzî (d. 328/939), *Al-Kâfî*, *Ar-Rawdah*, 8:101.
9 Al-Arbilî, Bahâ'ud-Dîn Abul-Hasan `Alî Ibn `Îsâ Al-Arbilî Ibnul-Fakhr (d. 692), *Kashful-Ghummah fî Ma`rifat Al-A'immah*, 2:173.

running but found `Uthmân had already passed away, and they began to weep.[10] `Alî, Talhah, Az-Zubayr, Sa`d, and other Muslims from the *Muhâjirûn* and the *Ansâr* (Supporters) were informed about that, and when `Alî arrived at `Uthmân's house, he was driven to distraction with grief. He said to Al-Hasan and Al-Husayn, "How come that the Emir of the Believers was killed while you were guarding his door?" Then he slapped Al-Hasan on the face, struck Al-Husayn in the chest, and sharply reproached Muhammad Ibn Talhah and `Abdullâh Ibn Az-Zubayr.[11]

The Bond between the Household of the Prophet and the Companions

`Alî showed his great love for the three Rightly-guided Caliphs who preceded him by naming three of his sons after them. The Shia books mention Abû Bakr Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, `Umar Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, and `Uthmân Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib.[12] Further, Alî married his daughter, Umm Kulthûm, to `Umar Ibnul-Khattâb. Besides, Al-Husayn named his sons Abû Bakr and `Umar, and his sons did the same after him. This is an obvious expression of love for and affection for the Companions of the Prophet. This,

---

[10] This was reported by "`Alî and Talhah and Az-Zubayr and Sa`d and other Companions of the Prophet.

[11] Al-Mas`ûdî, Abul-Hasan `Alî Ibnul-Husayn Al-Mas`ûdî (d. 345/956), *Murûj Adh-Dhahab wa Ma`âdin Al-Jawhar*, 2:344.

[12] See At-Tubrasî, *I`lâm Al-Warâ*, p. 203, Al-Mufîd, *Al-Irshâd*, p. 186, Al-Ya`qûbî, *Târîkh*, 2:213, Abul-Faraj Al-Asfahânî, *Maqâtil At-Tâlibiyyîn*, p. 142, Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, 2:64, and Al-Majlisî, *Jalâ' Al-`Uyûn*, p. 182.

too, is recorded in the Shia books.[13] As for Imam Mûsâ Ibn Ja`far, the Seventh Imam, one of his sons was also named Abû Bakr,[14] and he named one of his daughters `Â'ishah,[15] just as his grandfather, `Alî Ibnul-Husayn Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib had done before him.[16] Likewise, the Tenth Imam, `Alî Ibn Muhammad Al-Hâdî, named a daughter `Â'ishah and a son Al-Hasan.[17] By the same token, `Abdullâh Ibn Ja`far Ibn Abû Tâlib had a son named Abû Bakr,[18] and Al-Hasan Ibn `Alî named one of his sons `Umar.[19] Ja`far As-Sâdiq, the Sixth Imam, used to say, "Abû Bakr begot twice."[20] This is because the name Abû Bakr appeared in the names of both his mother, Fâtimah Bint Qâsim Ibn Abû Bakr, and his maternal grandmother, Asmâ' Bint `Abdur-Rahmân Ibn Abû Bakr[21].

This confirms that the Shias differ with the Prophet's Household over the Companions. Are there any Shias who are proud to name their children after Abû Bakr

---

[13] See At-Tubrasî, *I`lâm Al-Warâ*, p. 213, Al-Ya`qûbî, *At-Târîkh* (*History*), 2:228, Abul-Faraj Al-Asfahânî, *Maqâtil At-Tâlibiyyîn*, pp. 78, 119, Al-Mas`ûdî, *At-Tanbîh wal-Ishrâf*, p.263, and Al-Majlisî, *Jalâ' Al-`Uyûn*, p. 582.

[14] Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, 2:217, and Abul-Faraj Al-Asfahânî, *Maqâtil At-Tâlibiyyîn*, p. 561.

[15] Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, 2:90.

[16] Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, 2:334, Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Ibn `Alî Al-Mashgharî, *Al-Fusûl Al-Muhimmah fî Usûl Al-A'immah*, p. 283.

[17] Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, 2:334 and Al-Mashgharî, *Al-Fusûl Al-Muhimmah*, p. 283.

[18] Abû Faraj Al-Asfahânî, *Maqâtil At-Tâlibiyyîn*, p. 123.

[19] Al-Ya`qûbî, *Târîkh*, 2:228, Jamâlud-Dîn Ahmad Ibn `Alî Ibn `Inabah (d. 828/ 1424), *`Umdat Al-Tâlib fî Nasab Âl Abû Tâlib*, p. 81, Al-Qummî, *Muntahâ Al-Âmâl*, 1:240, and Al-Mashgharî, *Al-Fusûl Al-Muhimmah*, p. 166.

[20] Ibn `Inabah, *`Umdat Al-Tâlib*, 195, Al-Mufîd, *Al-Irshâd*, p. 186, and Al-Kulaynî, *Kitâb Al-Kâfî*, 1:472.

[21] Who at the same is the mother of Fâtimah Bint Qâsim.

or `Â'ishah as the Household of the Prophet themselves have done? Or is this another mistake that the "infallible" Imams are guilty of? Is it an error like the oath of obedience to Abû Bakr and `Umar, or like Al-Hasan's abdication in favor of Mu`âwiyah?

In the light of this, we may put the Shia's "love" for the Prophet's Household to the test. And a question rises: Do the Shias follow the example of the Prophet's Household regarding naming their children Abû Bakr, `Umar, `Uthmân, and `Â'ishah? If not, then what can we make of their claim to follow them?

The Unknown Martyrs of Karbala with Al-Husayn

Many Shias may be shocked to hear the news, normally kept from them, that Al-Husayn had a brother and a son, who were both named Abû Bakr, and he had a second brother called `Umar, and that all the three were martyred with him at Karbala. Many important Shia sources mention this.[22] According to Al-Majlisî, for example, "`Umar Ibnul-Hasan Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib was martyred at Karbala along with Al-Husayn." Al-Asfahânî contradicts him, though, maintaining that `Umar Ibnul-Hasan was not killed, but taken prisoner.[23] Thereon, according to the Shia scholars, Al-Husayn's brother, Abû Bakr, and his son, also called Abû Bakr, and Al-Hasan's son, `Umar, were all martyred with Al-Husayn at Karbala. All the three of them bore the names of men the Shias insist wronged the Household of the Prophet and usurped their rights.

---

[22] See Abul-Faraj Al-Asfahânî, *Maqâtil At-Tâlibiyyîn*, pp. 87, 142, 188, Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, 2:64, Al-Majlisî, *Jalâ' Al-`Uyûn*, p. 582, Al-Mas`ûdî, and *At-Tanbîh wa Al-Irshâd*, p. 263.

[23] Abul-Faraj Al-Asfahânî, *Maqâtil At-Tâlibiyyîn*, p. 119.

It is strange that the names of these men are never heard during the dramatic reenactments of the martyrdom of Al-Husayn staged every year on `Âshûrâ' (the tenth day of Muharram). These three bear the names of two men whom the Shias curse daily. The Shia scholars try to keep these things quiet for fear that the deep bonds and profound love of the Prophet's Household for the Companions would be exposed. They especially fear the respect of the Prophet's Household for Abû Bakr and `Umar.

Imâm Mâlik's Response to the Hatred of the Companions

A man once came to Imâm Mâlik and said:

"I hate so and so," and mentioned some of the Companions of the Prophet. Imâm Mâlik quoted, in reply, the following verse:

{"For the poor emigrants who were expelled from their homes and their properties, seeking bounty from Allah and [His] approval and supporting Allah and His Messenger, [there is also a share]. Those are the truthful… "}[24]

Adding, "Are you one of these people [mentioned in the verse]?"
"No," the man replied.
Then Imâm Mâlik recited another verse:

[24] Qur'ân (59: 8).

{"And [also for] those who were settled in the Home [i.e. Medina] and [adopted] the faith before them. They love those who emigrated to them and find not any want in their breasts of what they [i.e. the emigrants] were given but give [them] preference over themselves, even though they are in privation."}[25]

"Are you one of these people?" asked the Imâm.
"No," the man said.
Then Imâm Mâlik read the verse:

{"And [there is a share for] those who came after them, saying, "Our Lord, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith and put not in our hearts [any] resentment toward those who have believed."}[26]

"Are you one of these?" Imâm Malik asked.
"I hope so," the man replied.
"You are not, if you curse one of the formers," Imâm Mâlik said.

A similar debate is attributed to `Alî Ibnul-Husayn Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, related by Al-Arbilî in his *Kashful-Ghummah*.[27]

Those who curse Abû Bakr and `Umar forget that they were not only the Prophet's Companions, but his relatives by marriage as well. The Prophet's daughters, Ruqaiyyah and Umm Kukthûm, were married to `Uthmân, and the Prophet's wife, `Â'ishah, was a

[25] Qur'ân (59: 9).
[26] Qur'ân 59:10.
[27] Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, p. 2:78.

daughter of Abû Bakr. Another of his wives, Hafsah, was a daughter of `Umar. Can anyone say that the Prophet took bad people for friends, bad people for Companions, and bad people for wives, while he ordered the Muslims not to take bad people for friends, or for companions, or for wives?

CHAPTER EIGHT

WHO KILLED AL-HUSAYN?

There is an important question we should now ask: Who really killed Al-Husayn? Was it Sunnis? Was Mu`âwiyah responsible, or was it his son Yazîd?

The astonishing truth is that many Shia sources confirm that the Shia or supporters of Al-Husayn murdered him. As-Sayyid Muhsin Al-Amîn says, "Twenty thousand people in Iraq swore the oath to Al-Husayn, but betrayed him and rose against him. They turned their backs on their pledge and murdered him."[1]

Al-Husayn confronted his murderers at Karbala saying:

> Did you not write to me and say that the time had come, and that you were presenting me with new recruits? A plague on you! Woe to you! You were driven to distraction and called on me for help. You sharpened a sword for us that was already in our hands, and kindled a fire we had already set to consume your enemies and ours. Then, you turned

[1] As-Sayyid Muhsin Al-Amîn, *A`yân As-Shî`ah*, 1:34.

against your friends and joined your enemies. You rushed to swear the oath to me, falling upon me as you fall into your beds. Then you disregarded your oaths foolishly. Away with the tyrants of this nation![2]

Al-Hurr Ibn Yazîd, one of Al-Husayn's companions, asked them, "Did you not call this pious servant of Allah? — Yet, when he came, you did not submit yourselves to him. — Did you not [instead] rise against him and try to make him your prisoner? May Allah not relieve your parched throats on the Day of the Great Thirst (i.e., the Day of Resurrection)."[3]

Al-Husayn called on Allah saying:

"O Allah, if you will spare them for a while, then split them asunder and never allow them to rise again. Let the imams (those in authority) never be pleased with them. They called on me and said that they would support me until victory. Then they turned to fight against me."[4]

The Shia historian, Al-Ya`qûbî,[5] mentions that when `Alî Ibnul-Husayn entered Kufa, he saw the women of the town wailing and screaming and commented saying, "These

---

[3] At-Tubrasî, *Al-Ihtijâj*, p. 145.

[4] Al-Mufîd, *Al-Irshâd*, p. 234 and At-Tubrasî, *I`lâm Al-Warâ*, p. 242.

[5] `Alî Ibn Abû Ya`qûb Ibn Ja`far Ibn Wahb Ibn Wâdih Al-Kâtib Al-`Abbâsî Al-Ya`qûbî (d. 284/897).

people are crying for us, but who has been fighting us?"[6] He means that it was they who killed the members of the Prophet's Household.

When Al-Hasan renounced his claim on the caliphate, abdicated to Mu`âwiyah, and reconciled with him, he addressed the people of Kufa, who had fought Al-Husayn and betrayed him, saying:

> "O People of Kufa! You have confounded my heart thrice. You murdered my father, deprived me of my wealth, and assaulted my person. I have sworn allegiance to Mu`âwiyah, so follow him and obey."

Hearing this, a man from the tribe of Banû Asad stabbed him so hard on the thigh that it split open revealing the bone.[7]

This is what the Shia scholars have written, page by page. Clearly, those who claim to support Al-Husayn are the same people who murdered him. They continue to shed tears for him, and make a show of their grief. Even today, they march in his funeral procession. If their grief truly reflects their great love for the Household of the Prophet, why do they not grieve for the Prophet's uncle Hamzah? He was killed in horrible circumstances, which were no easier than those of Al-Husayn at Karbala; Hamzah's belly was cut open and his liver ripped out. So why do they not stage an annual commemoration of his death, slapping themselves in the face, ripping their clothes and striking themselves with swords and daggers? Is Hamzah not a member of the Household of the Prophet? Why

---

[6] Al-Ya`qûbî, *At-Târîkh*, 1:235.

[7] Al-Arbilî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, p. 540, Al-Mufîd, *Al-Irshâd*, p. 190, Al-Mashgharî, *Al-Fusûl Al-Muhimmah*, p. 190, and Al-Mas`ûdî, *Murûj Al-Dhahab*, 2:431.

do they not grieve so for the death of the Prophet? Surely, our loss of the Prophet was greater than any other.

`Âshûrâ' is an Occasion for Joy, not Grief

`Âshûrâ' is a time of rejoicing and giving thanks to Allah. The first time the Prophet entered Medina, he found the Jews there fasting. When he asked them why they were fasting, they replied, "This is a great day on which Allah saved Mûsâ and drowned Pharaoh." The Prophet said to them, "I have a greater right on Moses than you." He fasted that day, and ordered the Muslims to do likewise.[8] How did the Prophet's act of *Sunnah* change from fasting out of rejoicing to beating oneself and wailing in grief?

The Position of `Alî and his Sons with respect to their "Shia"

Many Shia books, such as *Nahjul-Balâghah*, speak of the anger of `Alî and his sons at their "*Shia*." For example, when `Alî was preparing to go out to fight Mu`âwiyah, he addressed them saying:

> "Did I not tell you to fight these people day and night, openly and secretly? Did I not tell you to strike them before they strike you? You dream of victory but will not work for it. You became lazy and enjoyed yourselves until you were attacked. When I called for jihad, you did not fight. I called on you openly and in secret but you did not respond. I fix you in the morning, but you return at noon as mean as the serpent.

---

[8] Related by Al-Bukhârî and Muslim.

Would that I had never seen you and never known you. May Allah strike you down. You have filled my heart with rage and lain a heavy weight upon my breast. You have ruined my reputation with your disobedience and desertion, to the point that Quraysh said that `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib is a courageous man but he does not know anything about war.[9] . . . Would that Allah separate me from you and grant me more worthy companions than you. O Allah, I have grown weary of them and they of me. I have vexed them and they me. Grant me better company than them, and grant them [a leader] less than me.[10]

"Oh you, whose bodies are present, but whose minds are absent, you who have so many desires and whose leaders are so unlucky to have you, your leader obeys Allah and you disobey him, while the lord of Syria disobeys Allah and his men obey him. By Allah, I wish that Mu`âwiyah would trade with me so that I would trade ten of you for one of his men."

"I give praise to Allah for what He has ordained and for trying me with you. You, the party who when ordered [to do something] does not obey and when called does not respond. By Allah, when it is time to pass away, Allah shall certainly separate me from you as I am averse to your company. Is it not strange that when Mu`âwiyah calls upon scoundrels and louts, they swear allegiance to him without asking him for anything in exchange? When I ask you for help, you break away from me and contradict me!"[11]

[9] Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, pp. 68, 70.
[10] Ibid. p. 65.
[11] Ibid. part II, p. 100.

"O People of Kufa! I have been afflicted with three things, and two: The deaf who are hearing, the mute who are speaking, and the blind who are sighted. No free man keeps his word, and no brother is steadfast in adversity. You are like camels without a herdsman. Whenever you are gathered from one direction, you wander off in another."[12]

"By Allah, I knew that Mu`âwiyah's people would totally defeat you. Their unity in falsehood is stronger than your difference over the truth. Yours is the rightful Imam but you defy him. They follow a usurper but they obey him. They are honest with their leader while you betray yours. They conduct themselves properly in their country and you ruin yourselves in yours. By Allah, I have come to doubt everything you say, and I am in no need of your support. I cannot confront any foe with the likes of you. What is the matter with you? What is to be done with you? I seek help with you to overcome distress but in fact you are my affliction."

"Enough! I am weary of rebuking you. Are you satisfied with the life of this world rather than the Hereafter? When I called you to fight your enemies, eyes revolve as if you would die of hardship. You do not understand a thing. By Allah, I am sure that were you to hear the sounds of battle and catch the smell of death, you would loose your heads and flee from `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib."[13]

[12] Ibid. pp. 188-189.
[13] Ibid. pp. 65, 75, 38-82.

"When I call you to go out in the days of summer, you say, 'Leave us until the heat breaks.' And when I call upon you in the days of winter, you say, 'Leave us until the cold weather passes.' All of this is only fleeing from hot and cold."[14]

"I am plagued by men who do not obey when they are commanded, who do not respond when they are called. Why do you turn your backs from every victory from your Lord? Have you no faith to bind you together, no zeal to fire you to battle? I stand in your midst haranguing you, calling for your help, but you do not hear a word nor do you obey an order. I swear by Allah that whoever seeks victory through you is despised."[15]

The Position of Prophet's Household on the Shias

Al-Hasan Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib said:

"By Allah, Mu`âwiyah is better for me than those [people of Kufa] who claimed to be my Shias (supporters). They hoped to kill me and then robbed me. By Allah, an agreement with Mu`âwiyah through which I spare my blood and secure my own family would be better for me than being killed (at their hands). By Allah, had I fought Mu`âwiyah, they would surely have seized me and handed me over to him. To submit to him willingly and honored is better for me than to [face him] and be killed as a prisoner."

[14] Ibid. p. 69.
[15] Ibid. pp. 90, 118.

According to At-Tubrasî, Al-Husayn said that he was "familiar with the people of Kufa and their treachery. Their loyalty is to no one and they are treacherous in word and deed. They are fond of dispute and say their hearts are with us, yet their swords are raised against us."[16] Besides, `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib is quoted as saying, "Basra is the place where Iblîs (Satan) fell to earth; it is the source of every trial and tribulation."[17] Further Al-Kulaynî reported that Imam Mûsâ Al-Kâzim said, "If I were to characterize my Shias, I would say I found them to be nothing but heretics."[18]

---

[16] At-Tubrasî, *Al-Ihtijâj*, pp. 149-149.
[17] Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 3:18.
[18] Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kâfî, Ar-Rawdah*, 8:228.

CHAPTER NINE

TEMPORARY MARRIAGE

The Sunnis and the Shias agree that temporary marriage was regarded as an allowable thing in the early days of Islam. This is confirmed by both Imâms Al-Bukhârî and Muslim and other compilers of *H̲adîth*. The Sunnis, however, believe that temporary marriage was later forbidden and contradict the Shias for continuing to practice it. They (the Shias) still rely on early *h̲adîth*s and reports that confirm temporary marriage while neglecting later *s̲ah̲îh̲* [authentic] ones that forbid it. The *Sharî`ah* clearly tolerated temporary marriage, at one point, but it was later forbidden absolutely and for all time. Wine was also tolerated and deemed allowable in the beginning of Islam, but later prohibited. By the same token, the Companions used to eat the flesh of domestic donkeys before being prohibited. In a nutshell, temporary marriage, wine, and domestic donkey flesh were all forbidden after having been allowable.

Shia scholars recognize that some *h̲adîth*s are abrogated by later ones. Their books also support the repeal of verses in the Qur'ân by *h̲adîth*s.[1] With regard to temporary marriage, Shia scholars view that it was forbidden by `Umar Ibnul-Khat̲t̲âb, while `Alî Ibn Abû T̲âlib confirmed its prohibition during his Caliphate, and the Companions did not object to this. `Alî would not confirm something that was incorrect, and he would not as well conceal any part of religious knowledge that came to him. Allah took the covenant of people who have knowledge to explain the truth, and not to conceal any part of what they know. Further, the Prophet has said, *"Whoever conceals anything of religious knowledge will be bridled on the Day of Resurrection with a bridle of fire."*[2]

Besides, the temporary marriage practiced and propagated by the Shias is completely different from the one that was once allowable in the early days of Islam and later forbidden for good. Consider the following points:

* The Shia have made temporary marriage an essential pillar of religion, and declared that whoever maintains that it is forbidden has denied religion. According to Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî [As̲-S̲adûq] and Al-Kâshânî, Imam Ja`far As̲-S̲âdiq said, "Temporary marriage is [a part] of my religion and the religion of my predecessors. Whoever practices it practices our religion. Whoever denies it denies our religion, — believes in something other than our religion."[3]

---

[1] Al-Murtad̲â, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, p. 26.

[2] Abû Dâwûd and At-Tirmidhî, and Al-Albânî confirms that it is a *s̲ah̲îh̲* (authentic) *h̲adîth*, see Al-Albânî, *At-Targhîb*, No. 116.

[3] Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî, *Man lâ Yah̲d̲uruhu Al-Faqîh*, 3:366 and Fath̲ul-Allâh Al-Kâshânî, *Tafsîr Manhaj As̲-S̲âdiqîn*, 2:495.

* The Shias hold that temporary marriage is an act of merit that averts Allah's wrath. According to them, the Prophet said, "Whoever contracts a temporary marriage is safe from the wrath of the Compeller [Allah]."[4]

* The Shias link temporary marriage with Allah's forgiveness, and claim that Jibrîl (Gabriel) said to the Prophet during his ascension to heaven, "O Muhammad, Allah said, 'The women of your nation who have contracted a temporary marriage will earn My forgiveness.'"[5]

According to Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî, a man came to Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq and asked whether the person who contracts a temporary marriage be rewarded? "If he does it for the Sake of Allah Almighty," the Imam replied, "Allah will record a good deed for him for every word he tells her. He will earn the forgiveness of Allah for sleeping with her. [Afterwards,] when he bathes himself, he will be forgiven for every drop of water that touches him."[6]

* The Shias made temporary marriage a deed to be rewarded with Paradise. They strongly believe that thanks to it, a person will be ranked with the Prophets in Paradise. They claim that the Prophet said, "Whoever contracts a temporary marriage is safe from the wrath of the Compeller [Allah]. Whoever contracts twice will be among the righteous. And whoever contracts three times will approach my rank in Paradise."[7]

* The Shia scholars caution people that failure to contract a temporary marriage will reduce their reward on the Day of Resurrection. They say, "Whoever leaves the

---

[4] Fathul-Allâh Al-Kâshânî, *Tafsîr Manhaj As-Sâdiqîn*, 2:493.
[5] Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî, *Man lâ Yahduruhu Al-Faqîh*, 3:463.
[6] Ibid. 3:366.
[7] Ibid. 3:366.

world without having contracted a temporary marriage will be brought back on the Day of Resurrection mutilated."[8]

* There is no limit on the number of temporary wives a man can have at one time. A man could marry as many as he likes in this way, even a thousand or more.[9]

* The Shia scholars permit temporary marriage to a virgin, without the permission of her guardian, and without witnesses.[10] This contradicts the Prophet's manifest instructions, *"No marriage [is valid] except with [the consent of] a guardian and [in the presence of] two witnesses."*[11]

* The Shia scholars also permit temporary marriage with underage girls. According to *Al-Kâfi*, Ja`far As-Sâdiq was asked about whether a young girl could be taken as a temporary wife. He said, "Yes, so long as she is not (so young) as to be mislead." When someone asked him what this meant, he said, "Ten years".[12]

* The Shia scholars also permit anal copulation with wives and claim that Imam `Alî Ar-Ridâ maintained that this was permitted by a verse in the Qur'ân, "… since Lût (Lot) said to his people {"*… O my people, these are my daughters; they are purer for*

---

[8] Fathul-Allâh Al-Kâshânî, *Tafsîr Manhaj As-Sâdiqîn*, 2:495.

[9] Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Ibnut-Tûsî Sheikh of *At-Tâ'ifah*, *Al-Istibsâr fîmâ Ikhtulifa fîhi min Al-Al-Akhbâr*, 3:143 and Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Ibnut-Tûsî, Sheikh of At-Tâ'ifah, *Tahdhîb Al-Ahkâm*, 7:259.

[10] Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Ibnut-Tûsî, Sheikh At-Tâ'ifah, *Tahdhîb Al-Ahkâm*, 7:254 and Najmud-Dîn Al-Hillî, *Sharâ'i` Al-Ahkâm*, 2:186.

[11] Related by Imâm Ahmad on the authority of `Â'ishah, and is regarded as a *sahîh* (authentic) *hadîh* by Ibn Hibbân, Al-Bayhaqî and Ad-Dâraqutnî. See Al-Albânî, *Irwââ Al-Ghâlîl*, No. 1858.

[12] *Al-Kâfî fi Al-Furû`*, 5:463, At-Tûsî, *Al-Istibsâr*, 3:145, and *Tahdhîb Al-Ahkâm*, 7:255.

you…"}[13] According to them, Lût said so though he knew that his people did not want to have intercourse through the vagina.

* According to the Shia scholars, there is no need to ask a woman before entering into a temporary marriage with her whether she is already married or a prostitute, since the only condition for temporary marriage is to pay an agreed upon sum of money (*mahr*)[14] to the woman. According to an account related by Al-Kulaynî, a man once came to Ja`far As-Sâdiq and said, "I travel from time to time and it could happen that I see an attractive woman, but I cannot be sure whether she is married or not." Ja`far told him, "It is not your responsibility to discover this. You only need to pay her the dowry." Who knows, perhaps temporary marriage would help fallen women abandon prostitution, as Khomeini mentions in his book *Tahrîr Al-Wasîlah.*[15]

* The Shia scholars maintain that the minimum time limit for a temporary marriage may be a month, or a day, or may be even an hour or less. The minimum time is simply the time it takes for a man to have intercourse with a woman.[16] They call this "**loaning private parts**."

BUT, if a man contracts a temporary marriage with a prostitute, and pays her the marriage settlement in exchange for sex, is this still prostitution? Besides, if we accept that the minimum period for temporary marriage is one month, as some Shia scholars maintain, then a woman could "marry" twelve men in the course of a year. What kind of honorable and respectable Muslim would allow his daughter, or sister, or mother, to

[13] At-Tûsî, *Al-Istibsâr*, 3:243 and *Tahdhîb Al-Ahkâm*, 7:514.
[14] Dowry: A kind of compensation specified in the marriage contract or after concluding it, and is to be paid by the husband. [*trans*].
[15] Cf. At-Tûsî, *Tahdhîb Al-Ahkâm*, 7:253.
[16] *Al-Kâfî fl Al-Furû`*, 5:460 and At-Tûsî, *Al-Istibsâr*, 3:151.

marry twelve men every year? Further, how many could she marry if the minimum period was less than one month? Could a woman spend her time jumping from bed to bed and say this is in the name of the *Sharî`ah*? Where is the decency and modesty Islam has given women? Does this not contradict the *hadîth* in which the Prophet (PBUH) has said, *"Indeed, I have been sent to perfect noble manners."*?[17] Those who zealously defend temporary marriage still refuse to allow their sisters, daughters, and mothers, to practice it believing that what is good for others is not good for them.

Debate on Temporary Marriage

This calls to mind an argument between two people, one Sunni and one Shia, about the temporary marriage:

"What is your opinion about temporary marriage?" the Sunni asked.
"It is allowed, and a good thing," the Shia replied.
"I am a stranger here," said the Sunni, "and have no wife in this country, could you lend me your sister or daughter as a temporary wife until I go back to my country?"
The Shia lost his temper and started cursing and insulting him.

Temporary marriage is an offense against women's honor and a despicable thing that turns them into a cheap commodity in the hands of those who hope to change doctrine [from Sunni to Shia]. The Shias use temporary marriage to entice the weak spirited, and

[17] Al-Bukharî, *Al-Adab Al-Mufrad* No. 273 and Al-Albânî, *Silsilat Al-Ahâdîth As-Sahîhah*, No. 45.

entangle them in their sect and present temporary marriage as an advantage of Shiism, something other Muslims do not have. Lust in the name of religion may attract young people who have little control of themselves. Those with base natures will be attracted to the unrestricted indulgence of sexual desire. The notion of temporary marriage denies women's honor in the name of love for the Household of the Prophet and lowers the lofty and noble status of women guaranteed by Islam.

CHAPTER TEN

TAQIYYAH (DISSIMULATION)

According to the Sunnis, the original ruling pertaining to lying [regarding one's religious beliefs] is that it is a prohibited, sinful act and a sign of hypocrisy, except in exceptional circumstances where, for example, it is allowable under duress; when a Muslim's life is gravely jeopardized by the disbelievers. For example, when a Muslim is forced by the disbelievers to deny Islam, he is allowed to say that he do not believe in order to save his live. Allah Almighty says, *{"Whoever disbelieves in [i.e. denies] Allah after his belief... except for one who is forced [to renounce his religion] while his heart is secure in faith..."}*[1] Even in this case, it is better to persevere silently and refuse to renounce faith even in the face of death. Allah, in His mercy, out of kindness to the believers, allowed the weak to deny outwardly what they believed in their hearts. This is not meant to be used deceitfully or dishonestly,

[1] Qur'ân (16: 106).

whether against disbelievers or Muslims. Dissimulation is allowed as a dispensation and is not strictness.[2] Besides, it is subject to two conditions:

1). It should only be used in dire necessity.
2). It should only be used against disbelievers, not against Muslims.

However, it is desirable not to resort to dissimulation at all. Believers beware of declaring disbelief, and always try openly to be Muslims, even if this costs them their lives.

The Shia Doctrine of *Taqiyyah*

The Shias regard dissimulation as permissible, whether out of necessity or convenience. Further, they make no distinction whatsoever between Muslims and non-Muslims when doing this act. They went further making dissimulation a central feature of their doctrine. For them, this is not a dispensation, rather strictness. They do not regard it as something to be used only under compulsion, and do not believe that it should only be resorted to in life threatening situations. For the Shias, dissimulation is a means of protecting their system of belief.[3] According to them, any Shia who denies this has denied Shiism and Islam.

[2] Dispensation is when what is normally forbidden is made permissible because of necessity or need. While strictness is what Allah initially legislates, of general rulings not concerned with one's circumstances rather than another's, or one individual rather than another. (*trans*).

[3] Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p. 61.

Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî said, "Dissimulation is an obligation that cannot be lifted before the return of the Imam.[4] Whoever abandons it before the Imam's return has abandoned the religion of Allah, Exalted be He, and the religion of the Shias, and has disobeyed Allah, His Messenger, and the Imams."[5]

According to Shia scholars, Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq said, "Nine tenths of faith is dissimulation. Whoever denies it has no faith."[6] We even find their Imams deliberately giving incorrect rulings, based on dissimulation. An-Nûbakhtî, for instance, says that `Umar Ibn Rabâh once asked Imam Abû Ja`far [Muhammad Al-Bâqir] a question. Later, he asked him the same question, but he answered differently. When `Umar Ibn Rabâh asked the Imam why he had contradicted himself, he replied, "The first response was based on dissimulation."[7]

The Shias regard dissimulation as an act of worship, an integral part of their doctrine, and a means of drawing near to Allah. This is something that no other religion can claim; not the Christians, nor the Jews, and not even the pagan worshipers of idols, all of whom agree that lying is a wicked, sinful act.

Islam requires its followers to be honest, upright, and steadfast. It forbids cowardliness, treachery, and deceit. Besides, dissimulation has a negative psychological effect since it encourages duplicity, for it depends upon a contradiction between what a person says and what he really does, and separates appearance from reality. None of this is compat-

---

[4] Imam Al-Mahdî, the Twelfth Imam of the Ja`farî Shias, also known as the “Invisible Imam”. See next chapter for a detailed discussion of the role of the Twelfth Imam in Shia doctrine [*trans*].

[5] Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî, *Al-I`tiqâdât Al-Imâmîyyah*, pp. 114-115.

[6] Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 2:217, 223.

[7] An-Nubakhtî, *Firaq As-Shî`ah*, p. 52, Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kâfî*, 1:65 on the authority of Imam Ja`far.

ible with Muslim behavior, which is characterized by honesty, straightforwardness, and firmness. Muslims must not be deceitful or hypocritical and should fear no one while acting in the service of Allah.

The lives of the Imams, who were persecuted and abused for raising the Word of Truth (i.e. Islam) and for standing up for what was right, clearly show that they were the furthest of all people from lying and double-dealing. Al-Husayn and his family faced death for the sake of truth, and Imam Mûsâ Ibn Ja`far went to prison many times for insisting on truth and opposing the Caliph Hârûn Ar-Rashîd.[8]

While Shia scholars deny that they use dissimulation freely and insist that it is only to be used in times of persecution, their books contradict them. There is a story in the *Al-Kâfî* about a man who asked Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq about the meaning of a dream. It happened that Abû Hanîfah was sitting with the Imam Ja`far and Imam Ja`far asked Abû Hanîfah to answer the man's question [interpreting his vision]. When Abû Hanîfah had finished, Imam Ja`far said, "By Allah, Abû Hanifah, that is the answer!"

After Abû Hanîfah left, the man said to Imam Ja`far, "I did not like the answer [interpretation] that lying Sunni gave me."

"He was wrong anyway," Imam Ja`far said.

"But you swore he had the answer."

"Yes. I said he had the answer, the wrong one." Imam Ja`far explained.[9]

This is obviously a casual use of dissimulation. The above-mentioned tale indicates nothing that could have forced Imam Ja`far to resort to dissimulation. We are not told that Abû Hanîfah held him at sword point, or demanded that anyone accept his

---

[8] Abbasid caliph, ruled 170/786 to 193/809. Imam Mûsâ Al-Kâzim died in 799 [*trans*].

[9] Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kâfî*, *Ar-Rawdah*, 8:292.

interpretation of the dream. Once one of the Shia Imams swore oaths that the Shias no longer resort to dissimulation. It was said to him that perhaps his oath had been taken as an act of dissimulation.

This points out that the doctrine of dissimulation has raised doubts about everything the Shias say. Naturally, people could not be blamed for doubting them. The blame must lie with those who made dissimulation an article of faith. They are the ones who have destroyed the Shias' credibility while imagining that by concealing the truth would undermine the confidence of others. Let them speak truthfully and give up dissimulation if they want to be trusted.

A simple illustration of dissimulation is the Shias' use of a small tablet made from the clay of Karbala[10] upon which they place their foreheads when prostrating in prayer. They carry these tablets with them, and always use them when they perform prayer in their own mosques. But when they enter a Sunni mosque, they keep these things hidden and follow the Sunni imam (leader in prayer), and then repeat their prayers when they arrive home.[11]

***Zakâtul-Khums*: The Charity of the "Fifth"**

THIS is a topic of crucial importance in the survival of Shiism, for the Shias have to give one fifth of their profits to their Imams. This adds up to a large sum of money and provides the Shia Imams with considerable wealth. This calls to mind a verse from the Qur'ân

---

[10] This is called a *qurs* [*trans*].

[11] Sheikh Mûsâ Al-Mûsawî mentions this. He was authorized as a *mufti* and *mujtahid* (two ranks of the Shia priesthood) by Sheikh Muhammad Al-Hasan Âl Kâshif Al-Ghitâ' at An-Najaf.

criticizing priests and monks from the Children of Israel for leading people astray in their pursuit of worldly gain. Allah says, *{"O you who have believed, indeed many of the scholars and the monks devour the wealth of people unjustly and avert [them] from the way of Allah… "}*[12]

The Shias support that practice with the verse that reads, *{"And know that anything you obtain of war booty – then indeed, for Allah is one fifth of it and for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives… "}*[13] They hold that the share of Allah, His Messenger, and near relatives is due to the Imam who stands in the place of the Messenger of Allah.[14] They do not accept that this verse is about war booty. On the other hand, there is no evidence from the biography of the Prophet, or that of `Alî, to support the idea that either of them ever took any portion of people's money for themselves. Nor will we find anything to support this in the chronicles from the time of the Prophet and the Rightly-guided Caliphs. While these chronicles even record the names of tax collectors, they do not mention that any one ordered the collection of any tax called *khums* from the Muslims. Even the Shia sources do not mention this.

Mu<u>h</u>ammad Ibnul-<u>H</u>asan A<u>t</u>-<u>T</u>ûsî, who founded *Al-<u>H</u>awzah Ad-Dîniyyah* (the Religious Institute) at An-Najaf in the beginning of the fifth century A.H., and was one of the greatest Shia scholars, has mentioned nothing about this in any of his well-known books on *Fiqh* (Islamic Jurisprudence), although he has discussed everything else imaginable. This has lead several Shia authorities, including A<u>h</u>mad Al-Ardabîlî – a *faqîh* who Shia called *Al-Muqaddas* i.e. the holy –, to regard the taking of *khums* as prohibited.

---

[12] Qur'ân 9: 34
[13] Qur'ân 8: 41
[14] A<u>t</u>-<u>T</u>ubrasî, *Majma` Al-Bayân fî Tafsîr Al-Bayân*, 4:543.

But there is another reason behind deeming this practice prohibited; that is the income it generates is enormous, which, in turn, has spoiled the Imams who exploit the generosity and ignorance of ordinary people in an obsessive pursuit of material pleasure. When we add the income from *khums* the great sums of money that people donate to the shrines of the Imams and the money that rolls into the pockets of the Shia Sheikhs, their wealth must be truly astonishing.

All these things contribute to the temptations and pleasures of the Shia cult and prevent them from taking a correct position toward their own teachings, the things they allow, and the mistaken doctrines that surround them on all sides. All of this has placed the Shia scholars among the wealthiest of all people. They may lead a life of unfettered indulgence of their material desires. Their sexual appetites are indulged by the women who long for the honor of offering themselves as temporary wives to the Imams and descendants of the Prophet. In this way, ordinary people are thus robbed of their property in the name of the love for the Household of the Prophet. That is why some of Shia scholars ascribe themselves to the Prophet's Household exactly as some of the Sufis do, since this claim is an assured way of earning gains. They should rather be far above caring for robbing people's property and above being a source of burden on them.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE TWELFTH IMAM: AL-MAHDÎ

The Sunnis believe that Allah will send a man, namely Al-Mahdî (Mahdi), from the Prophet's descendants who will come to support Islam. He will fill the earth with justice as it had been filled with oppression and iniquity. He will bear the name of the Prophet and his father.[1] The Sunnis also believe that Al-Mahdî will come in the last days of the world, at the time of Jesus' return. The Prophet mentioned these things in the presence of many of his Companions, many of whom have passed on to us continuously recurrent narrations of what he said and done.[2]

---

[1] That is to say, his name will be Muhammad Ibn `Abdullâh [*trans*].

[2] *Mutawâtir* (Continuously Recurrent) *Hadîth* is a *hadîth* reported by a large number of narrators whose agreement upon telling a lie is inconceivable (this condition must be met in the entire chain from the beginning to the end). [*trans*].

Unlike the Sunnis, the Shias believe that Al-Mahdî came long ago. According to them, he was Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Al-`Askarî, the Twelfth Imam, who, they say, was born in the second century A.H., son of the Eleventh Imam, Al-Hasan Al-`Askarî. Shias believe that at the age of five, Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan entered a cave and vanished. Though one thousand and two hundred years have passed, they are still waiting for him to reappear. We do not dispute the possibility of a man staying in a cave for thousands of years, for the Qur'ân speaks about the great age of Nûh, and about the Sleepers of Ephesus. Yet, it is enough to refute this notion to quote Shia sources which tell us that the story of that boy is baseless. There is another flaw in the tale; that is a boy of five years cannot hold the Imamate since one of the conditions made by the Shias for the Imamate is that its holder must have reached puberty.[3] According to Shia scholars, the Imam must be mentally competent, prudent, just, and well versed in the *Sharî`ah*.

These sources say that Imam Al-Hasan Al-`Askarî, the Eleventh Imam, died childless and had no children by his wife, or by any of his slave girls. When he died in 260 A.H., his relatives waited in vain to hear that any of his wives or slave girls was pregnant. His estate was finally divided between his mother and his brother Ja`far.[4] When the Sultan sent an emissary to interview his family, they confirmed officially that he died without issue.[5] Al-Mufîd confirms this and says, "He had no children born to him in his lifetime, and none posthumously."[6]

---

[3] Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, pp. 45-46.
[4] *Al-Kâfî*, *Al-Hujjah*, p. 505, Al-Mufîd, *Al-Irshâd*, p. 339, Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, p. 408, Al-Mashgharî, *Al-Fusûl Al-Muhimmah*, p. 289, Al-Majlisî, *Jalâ' Al-`Uyûn*, 2:762, and At-Tubrasî, *I`lâm Al-Warâ* p. 377.
[5] Al-Qummî, *Al-Maqâlât wa Al-Firaq*, p. 102 and At-Tubrasî, *I`lâm Al-Warâ*, p. 377.
[6] Al-Mufîd, *Al-Irshâd*, p. 345 and At-Tubrasî, *I`lâm Al-Warâ*, p. 380.

Despite this evidence, modern Shias insist that the Invisible Child[7] is alive today. He has now lived even longer than Prophet Nûh.

The Last of the Imams

The death of Al-Hasan Al-`Askarî exploded the myth upon which the Shia doctrine is based: that there has been a continuous and unbroken line of Imams since the Eleventh, and Last Imam left no heirs. The death of Al-Hasan Al-`Askarî resulted in more splits and schisms among the Shias who, being left without an Imam designate, began to differ over the leadership. Some of them turned to Al-Hasan's brother, Ja`far Ibn `Alî and thus rejected the Shia doctrine that the Imamate must pass from father to son.[8]

Following the death of Al-Hasan Al-`Askarî, one of his supporters, `Uthmân Ibn Sa`îd, began to spread reports of the "Invisible Imam," the hitherto unknown son of Imam Al-Hasan, called Muhammad, who was hidden in a cave. Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Al-`Askarî, said `Uthmân Ibn Sa`id, was the rightful Imam after his father, and he, `Uthmân, had been appointed as his intermediary to the world, and had been charged with the responsibility of collecting money from the people and bringing it to him in the cave. The Shias are still waiting for him to emerge from his cave, and send a man there to call into the cave saying, "Come out, May Allah hasten your relief!" When this man dies, he is replaced with another. The cave eventually became a great source of income, since the Shias go there and throw money into it hoping to be cured of illness, protected from evil, or granted some benefit in the world.

---

[7] Who is in fact called by the Shias the Invisible Imam. [*trans*].

[8] Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 1:285.

When asked why the Invisible Imam should have disappeared into the cave, the Shias reply that he feared for his life.[9] But this contradicts the Shia belief that the Imams die only by choice and that they have knowledge of what was and what will be.[10] Still, they insist that "Al-Mahdî" was in mortal danger form the Abbasid Caliphs, the Umayyads, and others. Despite this danger, he had had other opportunities to come out safely. One of such instance was when the Shia Buwayhid dynasty came to power in Iraq,[11] and again when Shah Ismâ`îl As-Safawî ruled Iran causing a massacre among Sunni Muslims.[12] A more recent opportunity appeared with the Iranian Revolution. But why has the Invisible Imam still not come out of this cave?

The Task of Al-Mahdî: the Meting out of Revenge

According to the Shia sources, when Al-Mahdî emerges, Allah will bring the Companions of the Prophet, who "usurped" the Imamate from the Prophet's Household, back to life again. Also, all the Imams of the Shias will be brought back at the same time. The first thing Al-Mahdî will do when he emerges is to chop off the heads of those Companions such as

[9] At-Tûsî, *Al-Ghaybah*, p. 199 and Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 1:338.

[10] Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 1:258.

[11] The Buwayhids ruled Persia and Iraq in the tenth and early eleventh centuries. The first Buwayhid ruler of Iraq was Mu`izzud-Dawlah Ahmad, who ruled 334/945 to 356/967. His son `Adud Ad-Dawlah united the families possessions in Iraq, southern Persia, and Oman. The dynasty was supplanted by the Seljuk occupation of Baghdad in 447/1055 and was finally deposed completely seven years later. (Bosworth, *Islamic Dynasties*, p. 97) [*trans*].

[12] Ruled 907/1501 to 930/1524. Shah Ismâ`îl introduced the Twelve-Imam Shiism as the official religion of Persia which, up to then, had been predominately Sunni. (Bosworth, *Islamic Dynasties*, p. 173) [*trans*].

Abû Bakr and `Umar. He will behead each of them with a single blow of his sword, beginning with Abû Bakr and moving from him to all of the caliphs. The Household of the Prophet will then be avenged. This belief is known among them as the doctrine of the Return.[13]

Those who invented this doctrine did not call it thus because Al-Mahdî would "return" filling the earth with equality, justice, and security, rather because the enemies of the Shias would "return" at the head of whom are the Rightly-guided Caliphs. Otherwise, what purpose would their return and beheading serve, when equality and justice had been achieved by the return of Al-Mahdî?

A better explanation for this doctrine is that it protects the Shia cult from disintegration and extinction. In order to invite people to embrace their cult and prevent them from leaving it, the Shias promise every new generation of Shias that Al-Mahdî will return soon, and insist upon the necessity of waiting for him, since he will avenge them. Such promises help keep the cult from dwindling and fading away.

No One shall Bear Another's Burden

According to *Tafsîr As-Sâfî*, when Al-Mahdî returns, he will kill the descendants of those who killed Al-Husayn in revenge for their ancestors' deed. He will also behead five hundred of the Quraysh, strike off the heads of Mu`âwiyah and Yazîd, and whip `Â'ishah.[14]

These ideas clearly contradict the teaching of the Qur'ân, that assures us that no one shall bear the burdens of another. The doctrine itself resembles Christian beliefs about "original

---

[13] Called *Ar-Raj`ah* in Shia books.

[14] Muhammad Murtadâ Al-Kâshânî, *Tafsîr As-Sâfî*, 1:172.

sin.” According to this Christian teaching, Allah's wrath is upon all the children of Âdam (Adam) because of the error of their father.

The Doctrine of “the Return” Stands in the Way of Reconciliation and Unity

How could the Shia ever hope for unity with the Sunni Muslims while they believe this doctrine of “Return?” This fills their hearts with the hope of revenge against the Companions of the Prophet, whom they say usurped the right of `Alî and wronged the Household of the Prophet with their claims upon the leadership of the community. Such thinking does widen the breach between the Shias and the Sunnis, and puts any hope of reconciliation and mutual understanding completely out of the question. As a result of such way of thinking, the Prophet's Companions are still reviled by the Shias day and night.

How could the Shia call for unity and reconciliation when every year at the festival of `Âshûrâ’ they reopen bitter wounds, and point at the Sunnis whom they accuse of killing Al-Husayn? Until the Shias release themselves from the past, hope of unity and reconciliation will only be a pipe dream. Since the cult is based upon these events, it seems highly unlikely that they will ever move toward sincere reconciliation, free from the taint of dissimulation and flattery. The Shias do not conceal their hatred for the Companions of the Prophet, who were the best of this nation. How, then, could we possibly hope that the Shias love us when we are much less than those they hate?

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE DOCTRINE OF MANIFEST KNOWLEDGE AND OTHER INNOVATIONS

Nearly all the Shias repeatedly say some words related to the doctrine of "manifest knowledge" on a daily basis, particularly when they visit the shrines of the two Imams `Alî An-Naqiyy Ibn Muhammad, the Tenth Imam, and Al-Hasan Al-`Askarî, the Eleventh Imam. At such occasions, they say the Arabic words for "Peace be upon you both, those of whom knowledge was made manifest to Allah."[1] While Shia books describe these ritual visits and instruct people to say this, most Shias do not know what "manifest knowledge" means.[2]

[1] The Arabic words for this are, '*As-Salâmu `alaykumâ yâ man Badâ lil-lâhi fî-Kumâ*' [*trans*].

[2] There are many books devoted to the subject of visits to the graves of the Imams, these are generically known as *Kutub Al-Ziyârât*. The above is quoted from the book *Mafâtih Al-Jinân*, p 29.

The doctrine of "manifest knowledge"[3] was invented to settle a dispute over the succession to the Imamate. Formerly, the Shia doctrine stated that the Imamate moves from father to eldest son and no other line of succession is possible. But when Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq's eldest son, Ismâ`îl, died in his father's lifetime, his younger son Mûsâ was designated by his father as the next Imam. In this case, the Imamate (in the form of designation) moved from Ismâ`îl to his brother Mûsâ. The normal procession from father to eldest son was thus broken.

Since the Shias believe that the Imam is divinely ordained, this change in the succession had to be attributed to Allah, but how should this be done? Did Allah not know that the divinely designated future Imam would ever succeed to the Imamate? How could the divine designation fail to be fulfilled? To solve this dilemma, the Shia scholars said that divine knowledge of the Imamate was suddenly made manifest to Allah. Put differently, what Allah did not know was then made apparent to him. Besides, former divine knowledge and present divine knowledge were different! In this way, the change to the succession was finally attributed to Allah, and not to the intervention of Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq. Undoubtedly, some Shias objected to this solution and a schism developed within the group. This is the origin of the Shia sect called Ismailis, which holds the belief that Ismâ`îl Ibn Ja`far was the last rightful Imam.

It is worth mentioning that Shia scholars try shyly to evade this notion while they never tried to eliminate such statement which ascribe to Allah what He is far above. That is because the doctrine of "manifest knowledge" rests on the claim that Allah, Blessed and

---

[3] "Manifest knowledge", *Al-Badâ'* in Arabic, signifies a kind of divine knowledge that came to Allah only recently and of which He was not previously aware. The notion also appears in Jewish theology, it is a contemptible idea which denies Allah's absolute knowledge of all things.

Exalted be He, is ignorant, and contradicts His divine qualities of omnipotence and perfect knowledge of all things. They, thus, endorse some of the erring beliefs of the Jews concerning the Attributes of Allah. Is it not a weird paradoxical conclusion that the Shias deny to Allah the attributes they ascribe to their Imams; that is to say absolute knowledge of all future events; knowledge that precedes even the creation of the universe? According to them, their Imams "know what was and what will be, they know what will not be and if it was how it would be."

Some Other *Bid`ah*s[4] of the Shias

Innovation in religion is forbidden, this is because Islam was revealed to the Prophet in a complete form. Religion is what we were taught in the Qur'ân and the *Sunnah*. Nothing has been left out of this and so nothing may be added to it. The Prophet repeatedly warned his Companions against introducing new forms of worship into Islam and told them that it would ultimately lead people to disbelief.

Additions to the *Adhân* (Prayer Call)

The Sunnis believe that `Alî was very close to Allah and dear to Him, but this cannot justify any change to the prayer call to confirm this fact, as the Shias have done. The Shias say in Arabic *Ashhadu anna `Aliyyan bil-Haqqi Waliyyul-Lâh*, this means, "I bear witness that `Alî is truly the *walî* of Allah (divinely appointed)." The Shias' prayer call contains three statements of belief:

[4] Matters innovated in religion.

1. Belief in the Oneness of Allah
2. Belief in the Prophethood and the Revelation
3. Belief in the divine appointment of `Alî (*Al-Wilâyah*).

This addition to the prayer call was not made during `Alî's lifetime, and he would certainly have disapproved of his name being added to it. Neither was this done in the lifetimes of his sons, may Allah be pleased with them all. The Shia scholars agree that this was rather introduced in the tenth century A.H., during the rule of the Shah Ismâ`îl.[5] The new prayer call became the hallmark of the cult and announced their existence in any town where it was heard. It also served to distinguish their mosques from those of the Sunnis. The new prayer call opened the door to other additions.

But, are Al-Hasan and Al-Husayn not also divinely appointed as they claim? What about the Imams Muhammad Al-Bâqir, Ja`far As-Sâdiq, and Mûsâ Al-Kâzim, are they not also divinely appointed? So why do we not say so in the prayer call? Every *bid`ah* comes with another like it. Accordingly, the Ismaili prayer call has grown extremely long since they mention the names of all the seven of their Imams in it confirming that each was divinely appointed.

This is not the only addition they have made to the prayer call, for they have added the Arabic words, "*Hayy `ala Khayr Al-`Amal*", "Hasten to the best of works." This too was

---

[5] Ismâ`îl Ibn Haydar ruled Persia 907/1501-930/1524. He spoke Turkish but probably of Kurdish origin, he established the Safavid dynasty which ruled Persia for nearly three hundred years. This dynasty was named for Sheikh Sâfiyyud-Dîn (d. 735/1334), who established a Sufi order, *As-Safawiyyah* at Ardabîl in Azerbaijan. Shah Ismâ`îl I, along with his successors, claimed not only to be descendants of Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, but also said they were reincarnations of the Shia Imams. (See Bosworth, *The Islamic Dynasties*, (Edinburgh, 1967) pp. 172-173 [*trans*].

added in later years. `Alî did not know anything about it or hear it, and so did all of his sons and all the members of the Prophet's Household.

We appeal to the Shias to abandon this practice and come back to the prayer call first raised by Bilâl in the Prophet's Mosque, in his presence and in the presence of his Companions, including `Alî.

Prostration on Clay Tablets[6]

The Shias prostrate on clay disks and hallowing stones, that have to be made from the clay of Karbala, the place of Al-Husayn's martyrdom. In this way, they link the one prostrating to Allah with Al-Husayn. Almost all Shia households have a collection of dust and stones from Karbala. They prostrate themselves on them, kiss them, and bless themselves with them. They always have those things with them even in their travel. But, the clay tablet has taken on another dimension too, for it provides a path to disbelief, and leads a man to be linked with something [or someone] other than Allah. The Prophet never performed prayer on such a tablet, nor did `Alî, nor any of the Prophet's Household, may Allah increase them in honor.

One of the examples illustrating the Shias' glorification of the clay of the tomb of Al-Husayn is what Muhammad Ibrâhîm Al-Qazwînî has said, "He, peace be upon him, has said, 'Prostration on the clay of the tomb of Al-Husayn illuminates the seven earths. The one who has a rosary from the clay of the tomb of Al-Husayn will be written among those who exalt [Allah] with praise, even though he did not praise [Allah].'"[7]

---

[6] These are known in Arabic as *At-Turbah Al-Husayniyyah* [*trans*].

[7] Muhammad Ibrâhîm Al-Qazwînî, *As-Sujûd `alâ At-Turbah Al-Husayniyyah* (*Prostrating on the Al-Husayn's Dust*), p. 34.

Combining Two Prayers

The Shia normally combine the *Zuhr* Prayer and the *`Asr* (Afternoon) Prayer and do likewise with the *Maghrib* (Sunset) Prayer and the *`Îshâ'* (Night) Payer. This contradicts the words of Allah who said, *{"... Indeed, prayer has been decreed upon the believers a decree of specified times."}*[8] This verse means that each prayer has a particular time. The Prophet has confirmed this although he used to join two prayers when traveling, or if it was raining, or in case of accidental illness.

Besides, combining two prayers runs counter to the Shia sources, which describe how `Alî once advised the rulers of a country "to lead the people in the *Zuhr* Prayer when the sun fills a fold of goats and to lead them in the *`Asr* Prayer when the sun is still white hot and one has walked two leagues. And to lead them in the *Maghrib* Prayer when the one fasting breaks his fast and when the pilgrim sets off [from `Arafât], and lead the *`Îshâ'* Prayer when the twilight fades away and until the end of night."[9]

Suspension of the Friday Prayer

Most Shia scholars maintain that attendance at the *Jumu`ah* (Friday) Prayer in a mosque is no longer obligatory. They leave it up to the people to choose whether to perform the *Jumu`ah* Prayer in a mosque or to pray it as the *Zuhr* Prayer at home.[10] This clearly contradicts the Qur'anic verse in which Allah says, *{"O you who have believed, when [the adhân] is*

---

[8] Qur'ân (4: 103).
[9] Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 3:82.
[10] Khomeini, *Tahrîr Al-Wasîlah*, 1:231.

called for the prayer on the day of Jumu`ah [Friday], then proceed to the remembrance of Allah and leave trade..."}*[11] The reason they give for this is that Imam Al-Mahdî has not reappeared, and as long as he is not present, there is no obligation to attend the *Jumu`ah Prayers.

This is a practical example of *bid`ah*s introduced by the Shia scholars into religion. While these practices increase the divisions between the Shias and the Sunnis, they are not less serious than some of the other things they do, such as seeking the assistance of others than Allah, raising the hands in supplication to the dead, attributing falsehood to Allah, claiming that the Qur'ân has been distorted, and insulting the Prophet's Companions and his wives, which, indeed, are the divisive things.

[11] Qur'ân (62: 9).

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

THE SHIAS IN HISTORY

The history of the Islamic world is full of tragedies inflicted on it by heretical groups. The Muslims suffered under the Fatimid state founded by the Ismaili leader `Ubaydullâh Al-Fâṯimî. Muslims endured campaigns of murder and assassination at the hands of the Al-Qarâmiṯah (Shiite Qarmatian sect of Ismailites), the Assassins, Al-`Abîdiyyûn (Ibadis), Ismailis, and the Buyids.[1] For example, in 317/930 the Al-Qarâmiṯah stormed Mecca

[1] Al-Qarâmiṯah; the Qarmatians: They were members of a social and political reform movement. This movement was co-opted by the Ismailis in the tenth century and was finally absorbed by them before the First Crusade. It was a "Shia" movement, in a general sense, but they tended to regard claims to `Alî's legitimacy as a means to attain power, rather than an end in themselves. Their political method was conspiracy, and they relied on strict secrecy, in which the name of the supreme leader was never pronounced. They instituted a system of gradual initiation and ritual, which may have reached the West and influenced the development of guilds and freemasonry. They had a philosophical doctrine that relied on an allegorical interpretation of the Glorious Qur'ân. They denied all divine attributes of Allah. Their

killing many pilgrims throwing their bodies into the well of Zamzam. Then they removed the Black Stone and usurped it. They were a constant source of trouble until the appearance of Salâhud-Dîn (Saladin), whom they tried to kill many times, but Allah confounded their plots with this man, who brought down the Al-Fâtimiyyûn (Fatimids) state and defeated the Crusaders utterly.

Who was behind the Fall of Baghdad?

The Tatars' sack of Baghdad and its destruction by Hûlâkû (Hulegu) Khan was the worst tragedy the Muslims had ever known; about two million Muslim persons were murdered and their women were taken as booty. This was the fruit of treacherous plots of two Shias,

---

doctrines seemed to owe much to pre-Islamic religious traditions. The Assassins were another Ismaili sect. At the time of the Crusades, they had adopted assassination as their favorite method of dealing with political opponents. The name comes from the Arabic word *hashshâsh* (a user of hashish). They did not differ from other Ismailis in matters of doctrine, but they followed a system of political organization into a secret league whose members owed blind obedience to the spiritual head. This and their use of murder as a political method is what distinguishes them.
The Al-`Abîdiyyûn are one of the sects of the Kharijites (the Seceders), now confined to Oman and some oases in southern Algeria. They were the followers of `Abdullâh Ibn `Ibâd Al-Murrî At-Tammîmî who left the main branch of the Kharijites about the year 65/684. They differ from the more extreme Kharijites in not considering non-Kharijites as disbelievers and rejecting political murder. They do not believe that the existence of an Imamate is an unconditional necessity. In later years, the Ibâdis split into at least twelve smaller sects and schisms. (*Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam*, (Brill, 1974), entries for Assassins and Al-`Abîdiyyûn, and Qarmatians).

The Buwayhids were a Shia dynasty that ruled Iraq and Persia in the tenth and eleventh century. (Bosworth, *The Islamic Dynasties*, p. 97) [*trans*].

Mu<u>h</u>ammad Ibnul-`Alqamî and Na<u>s</u>îrud-Dîn A<u>t</u>-<u>T</u>ûsî,[2] employed as ministers in the government of the last of the Abbasid caliphs, Al-Musta`<u>s</u>im bil-Allâh. These two men conspired against the Caliph and handed him over to Hûlâkû, and then they became ministers for the Tatar chieftain.

Ibn Kathîr mentions them in his book *Al-Bidâyah wan-Nihâyah* (*the Beginning and the End*) and says that Na<u>s</u>îrud-Dîn A<u>t</u>-<u>T</u>ûsî worked tirelessly to weaken the Caliph's army, which he finally reduced to ten thousand men. These were starved and impoverished to the point that they had to beg at the doors of mosques, and their salaries had been cut off. Ibn Kathîr says that Mu<u>h</u>ammad Ibnul-`Alqamî, a fanatical Shia who hated the Sunnis bitterly and wished to make the Shias rise above the Sunnis, was in contact with Hûlâkû, encouraging him to come and seize Baghdad, and was helping him with intelligence about political, military, and economic conditions within the Abbasid capital.

Ibn Kathîr also mentions that when the Tatars appeared at the gates of Baghdad, Na<u>s</u>îrud-Dîn was the first person to go to meet them, taking his family, companions and servants with him. Having met with Hûlâkû, A<u>t</u>-<u>T</u>ûsû returned to report to the Caliph Al-Musta`<u>s</u>im and suggested that he go and see Hûlâkû himself. He led Al-Musta`<u>s</u>im to

---

[2] In his biographical dictionary, *Al-A`lâm* (*Prominent Figures*), Az-Ziriklî said, "He [A<u>t</u>-<u>T</u>ûsî] was much respected by Hûlâkû who used to ask for his advice and follow it. A<u>t</u>-<u>T</u>ûsî was a philosopher who used to consult astrologers and even set up a trust to provide for their material needs. He murdered the Caliph (Al-Musta`<u>s</u>im), blotted out judges, scholars of *<u>H</u>adîth*, and *faqîh*s, while causing no harm to philosophers and astrologers. A general perusal of his books will reveal that he was deeply immersed in philosophical matters and much influenced by the ideas of Ibn Sînâ (Avicenna) and Ptolemy. He was also involved in magic and the occult and was a serious student of witchcraft, going so far as being initiated as a sorcerer and further he worshipped idols." (Az-Zarkalî, *Al-A`lâm*, vol. 7, p. 30). Despite this, Khomeini insists on praising him [A<u>t</u>-<u>T</u>ûsî] and wishing him blessings as we shall shortly see.

believe that Hûlâkû wanted to negotiate payment of a tribute. Nasîrud-Dîn and Ibnul-`Alqamî then went back with Al-Musta`sim to speak to Hûlâkû, who violently insulted the Caliph and ordered that he be dismissed. Nasîrud-Dîn advised Hûlâkû to kill the Caliph but the latter hesitated. Hûlâkû persisted urging Hûlâkû to kill Al-Musta`sim, leading him to believe that murdering Al-Musta`sim was an easy matter, until finally Hûlâkû ordered him to be killed. Al-Musta`sim was probably trampled to death, but some reports say he was strangled. A group of judges and scholars were murdered with him.

Then the Tatars turned their attention to the population of Baghdad; they gathered the men, women, children and old people together and murdered them. The "City of Peace" [Baghdad] was laid to waste. Rivers of blood flowed through its streets and an overpowering stench of death hung over it. The smell of rotten flesh spread out over Iraq and traveled with the winds as far as Syria. Damascus was struck by plague and disease when the foul air of Baghdad drifted its way.[3] No one survived the Tatar holocaust except for the Jews and the Christians and, certainly, the Shias, and those who sought refuge at the houses of Ibnul-`Alqamî and Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûsî.[4] As mentioned above, these two men became ministers for Hûlâkû after they had been ministers of the careless Abbasid Caliph, Al-Musta`sim.

Epilogue

[3] This is mentioned by Ibn Kathîr, Adh-Dhahabî and Qutbud-Din Al-Yunînî.

[4] Ibn Kathîr, *Al-Bidâyah wan-Nihâyah*, 7:13, 200, 204, 212, 215, 219, Imam Adh-Dhahabî, *Diwal Al-Islâm*, p. 159.

Some people may ask, what this has to do with us today, and whether it is right to hold all Shias responsible for what Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûs and Muhammad Ibnul-`Alqamî. We certainly cannot hold all the Shia responsible for what those two men did, but those [of the Sunnis] who are attracted by the words of Khomeini, who stirred many Muslims hearts with his promises to return Jerusalem and Afghanistan to the hands of the Muslims, should know that he never fails to praise Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûs. He prays for him and asks Allah to have mercy on him[5], and even says that At-Tûs played a major role in the victory of Islam. Khomeini also said, "People feel a great sense of loss for Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûsî and others (like him) who provided such a great service to Islam."[6]

It is a great misfortune that the Muslims fail to understand the real meaning of Khomeini's words. Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûs was, in fact, responsible for the death of two million Sunni Muslims and this is what Khomeini considers a great service to Islam. This throws fresh light on the crimes of Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûs and Muhammad Ibnul-`Alqamî, who joined forces with the Tatar tyrant. Khomeini asks Allah's pleasure for Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûsî,[7] yet the same invocation does not extend to `Umar Ibnul-Khattâb, whom he curses and reviles. Can there be any comparison between `Umar and Nasîrud-Dîn? Can we compare the man who liberated Baghdad and took it from the disbelievers, to the man who delivered it back to them? Why are the Shias so happy with Nasîrud-Dîn and so contemptuous of `Umar Ibnul-Khattâb and Abû Bakr? Is the companion and minister of Hûlâkû more honored in the sight of Allah than the Companions of the Messenger of Allah?

---

[5] Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p. 142.
[6] Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p. 128.
[7] Allah struck him down and he died epileptic.

If we understand the past, we can profit from it in the present, by taking it as an example of what could be. In the light of past events, we should be more vigilant in our dealings with the factions whose history is full of treachery and betrayals; who extend the hand of friendship to the enemies of this *Ummah* (Muslim nation).

Considering and the history of Islam will provide us with many examples of lessons which our lives do not suffice to experience. Many times these groups have brought misery upon the heads of the Muslims. They are today making their same old claims, and calling people to the same twisted doctrines, that so often moved their ancestors to betray and persecute the Muslims in the past.

The Druze

We should not forget the Druze of Lebanon, who deify Al-H̲âkim bi-Amrillâh [8] and believe in the transmigration of souls. They deny the rising of the dead, insult the Prophet Muh̲ammad, and call him a liar and a fraud in their secret holy book "*Messages of Wisdom*". We should not forget their shameless conduct toward the Muslims and their alliances with their enemies. The British depended upon them to execute their policies in the Levant, and their true nature was again revealed on the day Israel invaded Lebanon in 1982. Besides, an Israeli brigade of the Druze sect once visited the Druze of Al-Mukhtârah district, where they met with their brethren, the occasion that witnessed festivals and celebrations alongside speeches. In that same year the Druze and the Shia conspired together to strike the Sunnis in Beirut and have subjugated and smashed them.

Further, we should not forget the history of An-Nus̲ayriyyah (the Followers of Muh̲ammad Ibn Nus̲ayr), which is lousy with treacheries. They deify `Alî Ibn Abû

[8] The sixth caliph of the Egyptian Fatimid dynasty.

Tâlib[9] and believe in a qur'ân fabricated and written by their leaders, which is totally different from the Glorious Qur'ân known to all Muslims.[10]

Though the Twelve-Imam Shias appear to judge An-Nusayriyyah and Ismailis as disbelievers, there is, in fact, practical harmony in the past and the present among the triple.

Engraved into the memory is the period of Al-Hâkim bi-Amrillâh, who ordered to destroy Cairo and set it all ablaze. He killed a huge number of Muslims justifiably and unjustifiably, including his own ministers and counselors to the extent that it was said to him that there were no people left for him to rule. Besides, one can by no means forget the role played by most of the Shias of Mount `Âmil, who treacherously gave aid and support to the Crusaders.

Regrettably, the enemies of Islam read history through which they become acquainted with those sects and cults of deviated and destructive beliefs, who played a major role in obstructing the Islamic expansion and stood in the way of *jihad*. It grieves to the heart that those enemies make such erring groups play the same role today against the Sunnis.

---

[9] It is strangely paradoxical that while the members of that Shia sect, An-Nusayriyyah, deify `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, they sanctify at the same time `Abdur-Rahmân Ibn Muljim, `Alî's murderer, and `Abdullâh Ibn Saba', the Jew who sowed the seeds of Shiism.

[10] The qur'ân recited and used by An-Nusayriyyah comprises many chapters that are totally different from those of the Glorious Qur'ân, with the exception of some chapter titles derived from those of the Glorious Qur'ân. For example, they have chapters entitled *Ad-Dustûr*, *Taqdîsat Labbayka*, *Taqdîsat Abû Sa`d*, *An-Nisbah*, *As-Sujûd*, *As-Salâm*, *Al-Ishârah*, *Al-`Ayn*, *Ashhadu Annâ Allâha Haq*, *As-Sûrah Al-Kabîrah*, *Al-Imâmiyyah*, *Al-Khayr*, *At-Tûr* (unlike the chapter of the same name in the Glorious Qur'ân), *Al-Hijâbayn*, *An-Nuqabâ*. All these chapters have nothing to do with the Noble Qur'ân revealed to Prophet Muhammad; they are nothing but polytheistic means through which they invoke and supplicate `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib for relief and help.

Today we find some people working for Islam who urge us to forget these things. Some of them say that these stories are fabrications; others say they are no longer relevant and only stand in the way of Islamic unity. Yet others maintain that the Shias today have changed, and that the Iranian Shias and others who follow the Twelve Imams really represent a fifth "school of *Fiqh*," (named Al-Ja`farî School) alongside those of the Imams As-Shâfi`î, Abû Hanîfah, Ibn Hanbal, and Mâlik. They do not take the effort to read even one book of history to see the truth of the aims of these sects and the heretical beliefs they advocate. Some people working in the Islamic call today attempt to justify the false doctrine of the Shias. They ally themselves with them, stand with them, and seek help and assistance from them. This is what they call unity!

Unity is only with those who Acknowledge Divine Unity

Surely, the One Who commanded the Muslims to unite is the same One Who commanded them to disassociate themselves from those who call on other deities besides Allah. He told us how Ibrâhîm (Abraham) denied his people because they were worshipping something else alongside Allah. Allah, Exalted be He, says, {*"Indeed, we are disassociated from you and from whatever you worship other than Allah. We have denied you, and there has appeared between us and you animosity and hatred forever until you believe in Allah Alone… "*}[11]

How is it possible to unite with people who sanctify shrines and graves, invoke their dead Imams, and beg them for forgiveness? How can we unite with people who fill whole books with lies about the Prophet, putting false words in his mouth and in the

[11] Qur'ân (60: 4).

mouths of the members of his Household, whom Allah has raised in honor? How can we unite with people who claim that the Qur'ân has been corrupted, and who insult the Companions of the Prophet, accuse them of distorting the Qur'ân, and reject *hadîths* narrated by them? How could real unity be achieved with people who abuse the Prophet's wives, especially `Â'ishah and Hafsah, and deem temporary marriage and anal sex with women lawful? Allah's Religion is far above being in need of such fragile, useless unity, with people of such straying beliefs.[12]

[12] Khomeini issued a *fatwa* [juristic ruling] confirming the legality of killing the apostate Salman Rushdie, author of the novel *The Satanic Verses*. In his book, Rushdie transgressively lies about Allah and pokes fun at the Companions of the Prophet, and insults the honor of his wives. We have no objection about the basis of this *fatwa*, in principle. Yet, we object to the fact which the Shia scholars neglect to mention and refuse to acknowledge; that the most important and reliable of the Shia sources, such as *Al-Kâfî*, clearly maintains that the Glorious Qur'ân has been distorted and insults the Companions and the wives of the Prophet, upon whom be peace. These books are held in such high esteem that Khomeini said of *Al-Kâfî*, "All the fundamentals and juristic rulings of our religion are contained in *Al-Kafi*, do you think then that we simply may leave it on the shelf?" (*Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*). There is not very much difference between Salman Rushdie and An-Nûrî At-Tubrasî, the author of the book *Fasl Al-Khitâb fî Ithbât Tahrîf Kitâb Rabil-Arbâb* (*Proof of the Distortion of Allah's Book*), which seeks to prove that the Glorious Qur'ân has been distorted. Any book that raises doubts about the Qur'ân is a satanic book. On this basis, I say that there is no difference between Rushdie and At-Tubrasî for whom Khomeini asks forgiveness from Allah in his book *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah* (p. 68). Both of them [Rushdie and At-Tubrasî] claim that the Glorious Qur'ân has been falsified and they insult its sanctity, and deny Allah's promise to protect and preserve it illustrated in the verse reading, *{"Indeed, it is We Who sent down the Message [i.e. the Qur'ân] and indeed, We will be its guardian."}* (15: 9).

Islam is Unified around a Single Doctrine

The unity of Islam is linked to the unity of True Doctrine. Is it possible, then, to achieve unity between two factions, one that performs prayer facing Mecca and the other that turns its face toward a grave? Between a man who raises his hands to heaven, and one who raises his hands to the graves of Imams at Karbala and Samara?

Tawhîd, the doctrine of divine unity, is the basis of Muslim unity. The unity we seek is not with dead hearts and lifeless bodies. Unity with the Shias, even if possible, would never last long. Genuine unity enjoys the blessings of Allah, and must be based upon the supremacy of the Qur'ân and the *Sunnah*, not at their expense, or at the expense of the honor of the Prophet's wives and Companions.[13]

Unity is a Blessing from Allah

The unity of hearts is a gift from Allah. It is the natural result of the unity of doctrine, sources, and method. By these things, Allah bound the hearts of the pious *Salaf* (Predecessors) together; Allah Almighty has said, *{"… It is He Who supported you with His help and with the believers – And brought together their hearts. If you had spent all that is in the earth, you could not have brought their hearts together… "}*[14] Allah, Exalted be He, also reminds his worshippers of this blessing saying, *{"And remember the favor of Allah upon*

[13] Could the Shias call upon the Sunnis to be in unity with them while the former insult their parents? Are their parents dearer to them than the Companions of the Prophet and the Mothers of the Believers? If there was no goodness in these men and women then there can be no goodness in those who are less than them.

[14] Qur'ân 8: 62-63.

you – when you were enemies and He brought your hearts together and you became, by His favor, brothers."}[15]

It is our obligation to take a definite and an unambiguous position with respect to those who innovate in religion and those endorsing erring beliefs, be them from outside this nation of Islam or from those who affiliate themselves to it from within the Islamic nation. We must disapprove of whatever is wrong and not simply turn away from it for the sake of unity, which in such a sense would mean inclining toward them. Our actions must be based on forbidding what is wrong,[16] not upon flattery and hypocrisy.

When disobedience, innovation, and disbelief began to appear among the Jews and the Christians, Allah turned their hearts against one another and inspired enmity and hatred among them. This was the result of their distorting what Allah had taught them. They had no chance after this to claim any victory from Allah, nor to rule in His Name, nor to command any authority by virtue of any Revelation that had come to them until they submitted to what they had been taught and applied it. They had no hope of regaining their unity until they rejected the distortions that they had introduced in religion.

It is absolutely imperative that people come out clearly in support of truth, even if this means that those who prefer to follow their own desires abandon it, denounce it and call others to oppose it. The Prophets confronted their people telling them what Allah had required of them, and their people split between those who believed in the message of the Prophets and those who denied it. To illustrate by an example, the tribe of Quraysh accused the Prophet, upon whom be peace, of having split their community and broken families up, and likewise denied the faith that he had brought.

---

[15] Qur'ân (3: 103).

[16] Arabic: *An-Nahî `an Al-Munkar* [*trans*].

The Shia Call to the non-Muslims to Accept Islam

The Shias realize that it is impossible for them to call non-Muslims to their cult, or even to make it seem palatable to outsiders. They know that no one could ever accept Islam on the basis of Shia doctrines. Will people be convinced by insults and curses heaped upon the Companions? Will they make pilgrimages to the graves of the Imams, and to beat themselves with chains and wail and screech? Will they accept that the Qur'ân was altered and then take it for their divine book? Naturally, no one enters Islam by the door of Shiism. There is no place in Shiism for calling non-Muslims to Islam. On the contrary, their approach to Islam is always negative. They totally distort the beauty of Islam. Their acts of kidnapping and assassination, and their beating themselves with chains, daggers, and knives before television cameras, is itself sufficient to drive most people away from Islam.

Shia-Christian Dialogue

When a Shia calls a Christian to Islam, the Christian may [rightfully] ask:

"To what exactly you are calling me?"
"I mean to call you to Islam and not to exaggerate about the Messiah [Jesus]," the Shia replies.
"But you exaggerated about Al-Husayn and the Imams to the point that you claim that they were made of light even before the creation of the universe,"[17] the Christian retorts.

---

[17] Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p. 52.

"But you call to the Messiah for help and invoke him rather than Allah and call Mary for help," argues the Shia.

"But you too call Al-Husayn and Al-Mahdî for help saying, 'O Husayn!', 'O Mahdî'! and we do the same thing, but we say, 'O Messiah'!, 'O Mary!', so what is the difference between us and you?" the Christian asks.

"I am calling you to desist from worshipping the Messiah and not to name your children `Abdul-Masîh (i.e., the servant of the Messiah)[18], for the Messiah is a servant of Allah," protests the Shia.

"But do you not name your sons `Abdul-Hasan and `Abdul-Husayn[19] while they were only servants of Allah?" observes the Christian.

"You wish from the Messiah what you wish not from Allah. And you call him for help rather than Allah and you visit the graves of saints and monks," the Shia says.

"You walk around the graves of your Imams and call them for help rather than Allah and give money to the keepers of tombs as penance, and this is precisely what we do with respect to the Messiah and his mother and the apostles and the saints."

"And you lavishly praised the Messiah and exaggerated about him until you ended up worshipping him."

"You lavishly praised Al-Husayn and the Imams and went beyond all bounds in aggrandizing them to the point of placing them above the Prophets. You said that they have a magnificent place in heaven beyond that even of the nearest Angels and the Messengers of Allah.[20] You claimed that they were incapable of erring and forgetfulness and that they knew all things contained in the heavens and the earth, and that

[18] See note 8, p. 28 [above].
[19] Servant of Al-Hasan and Servant of Al-Husayn are two names used by Shias [*trans*].
[20] Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p. 52.

their knowledge is like the wisdom of the Qur'ân. So the Messiah for us is like an Imam for you. We say that belief in the Messiah and love for him are enough for us to enter Paradise, and you said that mere love of the Household of the Prophet is a means of atoning and salvation, and that your love for them cannot be tarnished by evil deeds."

The Shia says, "Your book has been altered and is filled with distortions, things taken out and things added."

The Christian replies, "But you claim that your Qur'ân has been altered and that the Companions added to it and took things from it. You say that there is not any complete and true copy of it other than the one kept with the Invisible Mahdî in his cave!

The Shias, thereon, have been happy with attempting to convert to Shiism the ignorant and those of infirm faith from this noble nation, who are but false scholars claiming to be the servants of Allah while they are in reality only servants to their own greed and ambition.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

THE SHIAS TODAY

Distorted beliefs must take their toll on the behavior of those who subscribe to them. The behavior of Shias in turn affects negatively the Islamic nation, which witnesses a rise and wakefulness these days. For many people today, Islam has become synonymous with killing and kidnapping, which is just what the enemies of Islam were hoping for. They [the enemies of Islam] fill the front pages of their newspapers with huge headlines about the latest outrage committed by the "Shia Muslims."

The Fruit of Twisted Beliefs

If a single visit to the grave of an Imam is equal to a hundred Pilgrimages to Mecca and is sufficient to guarantee that a person will enter Paradise, then why bother with Mecca? So the hearts of the ignorant are emptied of love for the Sacred City and for the Pilgrimage.

The Shias have replaced Sacred House with a grave thus regarding the former with little respect, to the degree that some of them were easily fooled to commit outrageous acts in the Sacred Precincts. They may even be capable of smuggling explosives into Mecca, as they did in 1986 when the plastic explosive C4 was found in the luggage of several Iranian pilgrims. These Iranian Shias can be used to disrupt the pilgrimage in other ways too, as in 1987 when they organized demonstrations and riots in which hundreds of pilgrims died. The Iranians' excuse was to show their opposition to America and Israel. But, literally days after these events, their "opposition" became even more disclosed with the discovery of secret arms deals between Israel and America on the one hand and Iran one the other hand via Israel, with the Jewish state playing the role of middleman and arranging transport of American arms to Tehran.

In January 1983 television viewers in Germany were shown the passport of Sheikh S̲âdiq T̲abât̲abâ'î, which contained an Israeli stamp. German customs officers also seized 1.8 kg of heroin from his bags. T̲abât̲abâ'î arrived in Israel on 6 December, 1980 in order to meet with Joseph `Âzâr, the Israeli contact with the Americans for arranging an arms deal to Teheran. The arms deal between Iran and America was reported in the *Herald Tribune*,[21] in the British news magazine *The Middle East*,[22] and in the Egyptian weekly *October*.[23] Then again, in 1989, a group of Kuwaiti Shias smuggled explosives into Mecca and attacked pilgrims therewith, killing one and injuring others.

The important point here is not to prevent or prohibit somebody from importing arms from whatever source he likes; rather, to show the hypocrisy of the Shias, who threaten

[21] 23 August, 1981.
[22] January, 1982.
[23] August, 1983.

the lives of pilgrims to show their opposition to America and Israel on the same day American arms are being shipped to the “Islamic Republic” via Israel.

All of this is evidence that the old hatred of the Shias manifested in their books has not yet disappeared, it has rather taken its natural and logical course into the modern age. The distortions of the past, in doctrine and ideology, are ultimately responsible for the rise of such men as Khomeini. So long as these aberrations of belief remain firmly implanted in people's minds, we will continue to be plagued by other "Khomeinis" in the future.

End

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SHIA SOURCES

Amîn, As-Sayid Muhsin al-, *□Iyân al-Shî□a,* Ibn Zaidûn Press, Damascus, n.d.

Amîlî, Hussain al-, *Wusûl Al-Akhiyâr □ila Usûl Al-Akhiyâr,* Maktabat al-Khiam, Qum, 1401.

Al-Ardabîlî, Bahâ'ud-Dîn Abul-Hasan `Alî Ibn `Îsâ Al-Ardabîlî Ibnul-Fakhr (d. 692), *Kashful-Ghummah fî Ma`rifat Al-A'immah,* Maktabat Bani Hashim, Tabrîz, 1381..

Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî (d. 381 h.), *`Uyûn Akhbâr Ar-ridâ,* Rida Mashhadî Shahraior, Iran, 1363.

——— . *Kitâb At-Tawhîd,*

——— .*` Aqâ'id Al-Imâmiyyah,* Muhammad Ridâ Al-Mudhaffar (ed.) Dâr Az-Zahra, Beirut, 1986.

Bahrânî, Sayyid Hâshim Al-, *Al-Burhân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân,* Al-Maktabah Al-`Ilmiyyah, Qumm, 1393.

Barjardî, `Alî Asghar, *`Aqîdat Ash-Shî`ah,* n.d.

Ibn Abû Hadîd, `Abdal-Hamîd Ibn Hibatul-Lâh Al-Madâ'nî Ibnul-Hadîd (d. 586/1190), *Sharh Nahjul-Balâghah,* Dâr Ihyâ' Al-`Arabî, Beirut, n.d.

Hillî, Najmudl-Dîn Al-, *Sharâ'i Al-Ahkâm,* n.d.

Ibn `Inaba, Jamâlud-Dîn Ahmad Ibn `Alî Ibnul-Husayn Ibn Muhannâ Ibn `Inabah Ibnul-Hasan Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib (d. 828/1424), *`Umdatut-Tâlib fî Ansâb Abû Tâlib,* n.d.

Al-Isbâhânî, `Alî Ibnul-Husayn Ibn Muhammad Ibn `Alî Al-Qurayshî Al-Isbâhânî (356/967), *Maqâtil At-Tâlibiyyîn,* Dâr Al-Ma`arifah, Beirut, n.d.

B

Jazâ'irî, Ni`matul-Lâh Ibn Muhammad Ibn Hussain Ibn `Abdullâh Al-Husaynî Al-Mûsawî Al-Jazâ'irî (d. 1050/1640), *Al-Anwâr An-Nu`mâniyyah fî Bayân Ma`rifat An-Nash'ah Al-Insâniyyah*, Jab Press, Tabriz, n.d.

Kâshânî, Fathul-Lâh Ibn Shukrul-Lâh al-, (d. 978/1570), *Minhâj As-Sâdiqîn fî Ilzâm Al-Mukhâlifîn*, n.d.

Kâshânî, Muhammad Murtadâ Mullâ Muhsin Fayd Al-Kâshî (Al-Kâshânî) (d. 1090/1697), *Tafsîr As-Sâfî*, Dâr Al-`Alamî, Beirut, 1979.

———. *Rijal al-Kâshî*, Dâr Al-`Alamî, Beirut, 1979.

Kâshif, Al-Ghitâ' Muhammad Hasan Âl, *Asl Ash-Shî`ah wa Usûluhâ*, Dâr Al-`Alamî, Beirut, n.d.

Khomeini, Ayatollah, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, Maktabat Bazrûk, Iran, n.d.

Al-Khû'î, Abul-Qâsim, *Al-Bayân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân*, Dâr Al-`Alamî, Beirut, 1394.

———. *Mu`jam Rijâl Al-Hadîth*, Dâr Al-Âdâb, An-Najaf, 1390.

Al-Kulaynî, Muhammad Ibn Ya`qûb Al-Kulaynî Ar-Râzî (d. 328/939), *Al-Kâfî* including *Al-Kâfî Ar-Rawdah and Al-Usûl min Al-Kâfi*, Dâr Al-Kutub Al-Islâmiyyah, Tehran, n.d.

Majlisî, Muhammad Bâqir Ibn Muhammad Taqiyy Ibn Maqsûd `Alî Akmal al-Majlisî Al-Isfâhânî (1110/1700), *Mir'ât Al-Uqûl*, Tehran, 1354.

———. *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, Dâr Ihyâ' At-Turâth, Beirut, 1403.

———. *Hayât Al-Qulûb*, n.d.

———. *Haqqul-Yaqîn*, Intisharât `Ilmiyyah Islamiyyah, Iran, n.d.

———. *Jalâ' Al-`Uyûn*

Mamaqamî, `Abdullâh Al-Mâmaqânî Al-Gharawî Al-, *Tanqîh Al-Maqâl fî Ahwâl Ar-Rijâl*, n.d.

Mûsawî, `Abdul-Husayn al-, *Al-Murâja`ât*, Dâr As-Sâdiq, Beirut, n.d.

Mashgharî, Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Ibn `Alî Ibn Husayn Al-Hurr Al-`Âmilî Al-Mashjarî (d. 1099/1624), *Al-Fusûl Al-Muhimmah fî Usûl Al-A'immah,* Maktabat Basîratî, Qumm, n.d.

Mudhaffar, Muhammad Ridâ al-, *`Aqâ'id Al-Imâmiyyah,* Dâr Az-Zahrah, Beirut, 1986.

Mufîd, Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibnul-Nu`mân Ibn `Abdus-Salâm Al-`Ukbarî Al-`Arabî Al-Hâritî Al-Baghdâdî Al-Mufîd Ibnul-Mu`allim (d. 413/1022), *Al-Irshâd fî Ma`rifat Hujaj Allâh `alâ Al-`Ibâd,* Maktabat Basîratî, Qumm, n.d.

———. *Al-Ikhtisâs, Mu'assasat Al-`Alamî,* Beirut, 1402.

Muqaddas Al-Ardabîlî, al-, *Hadiqat Ash-Shî`ah,* Tehran, n.d.

Murtadâ, Al-, *Nahjul-Balâghah,* Dâr Al-`Alamî, Beirut, n.d.

An-Nubakhtî, *Firaq Ash-Shî`ah,* Karbala, n.d.

Qazwînî, Muhammad Ibrâhîm al-, *As-Sujûd `ala At-Turbah Al-Husayniyyah,* n.d.

Râsî, Muhammad Ar-Râsî ar-, *Kadhabû `alâ Ash-Shî`ah,* n.d.

Samâwî, Muhammad At-Tîjânî as-, *Thumma Ihtidaytu,* Dâr Al-Fajr, Beirut and London, n.d.

Tubrasî, An-Nûrî al-, *Fasl Al-Khitâb fî Ithbât Tahrîf Kitâb Rabil-Arbâb,* mss. Tehran.

Tubrasî, Fadl Ibnul-Hasan al-, (d. 548/1153), *Al-Ihtijâj `alâ Ahl Al-Lijâj,* Dâr al-Murtadâ, Mashhad, Iran, 1403.

———. *Majma` Al-Bayân li `Ulûm Al-Qur'ân,* Maktabat Al-Hayâh, 1380.

———. *I`lâm Al-Warâ bi A`lâm Al-Hudâ,* Dâr Al-Ma`arifah, Beirut, 1399.

Taqiyy, Mirza, *Nâsikh At-Tawârîkh,* n.d.

Thaqafî, Ibrâhîm Ibn Muhammad al-, (d. 283/896), *Al-Ghârât,* Dâr Al-Dawâ', Beirut, 1407.

At-Tirmidhî, Imam, *Sunan.*

T̲â'ûsî, `Abdullâh Ibn Mûsâ Ibn Ja`far Ibn T̲â'ûs At̲-T̲âůsî (d. 664/1266), *At̲-T̲arâ'if fî Ma`rifat Madhâhib At̲-T̲awâ'if*, Dâr Al-Khiyâm, Qumm, 1400.

T̲ûsî, Muh̲ammad Ibnul-H̲asan At̲-T̲ûsî (d. 459/1067), *Tahdhîb Al-Ah̲kâm*, Dâr al-Kutub Al-Islâmiyyah, Tehran 1390,

——— . *Al-Istibs̲âr fîmâ ikhtulifa fîhi min Al-Akhbâr*, Dâr Al-Kutub Al-Ialâmiyyah, Tehran, n.d.

——— . *Al-Ghaybah*, Maktabat Bas̲îratî, Qumm, 1385.

Ya`qûbî, `Alî Ibn Abû Ya`qûb Ibn Ja`far Ibn Wahb Ibn Wâd̲ih̲ al-, (d. 284/897), *Ta'rîkh*, Dâr Sadir, Beirut, n.d.

Zar`î, *Rijâl Ash-Shî`ah fil-Mizân*, Dâr Al-Arqam, Kuwait, n.d.

SUNNI SOURCES

Albânî, Nâs̲ir Ad-Dîn al-, *Silsilat Al-Ah̲âdîth As̲-S̲ah̲îh̲ah*, Maktabat Al-Ma`ârif, Riyadh.

——— . *Irwâ' Al-Ghalîl; Al-Maktab Al-Islâmî*, Beirut 1979.

——— . *At-Targhîb, Maktabat Al-Ma`ârif*, Riyadh, n.d.

Athîr, Ibnul-, *Jâmi` Al-Us̲ûl min Ah̲âdîth Ar-Rasûl*, Maktabat Dâr Al-Bayân, Syria 1398.

Al-Bukhârî, Imâm, *Al-Adab Al-Mufrad*, no. 273, Dâr Al-Bashâ'ir, Beirut.

Mas`ûdî, Abul-H̲asan `Alî Ibnul-H̲usayn al-, (d. 345/956), *Murûj Adh-Dhahab wa Ma`âdin Al-Jawâhar*, Dâr As-Sa`âdah, Cairo, 1384.

——— . *Al-Tanbîh wal-Ishrâf*, n.d.

FURTHER READINGS

A NOTE ON CONVENTIONS

All dates have been given according to the *hijrî* calendar. Where two dates occur together, the second is according to the Gregorian calendar.

While the traditional blessings on the Prophet, upon whom be peace, have not been written each time his name is mentioned, Muslim readers are reminded to observe this *Sunnah*. The same applies to the names of the members of the Prophet's Household, his Successors and Companions, may Allah be pleased with them all.

Arab names have been given in the full form the first time they are mentioned in the text and bibliography, elsewhere short forms of names have been used.

The translations of verses from the Qur'ân appearing in this book are those of Saheeh International, unless otherwise indicated.